

THE ARTS IN
EARLY ENGLAND

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE ARTS IN EARLY ENGLAND

VOL. I—THE LIFE OF SAXON ENGLAND IN
ITS RELATION TO THE ARTS

VOLS. III AND IV—SAXON DECORATIVE ART
OF THE PAGAN PERIOD

VOL. V—THE RUTHWELL AND BEWCASTLE
CROSSES, THE GOSPELS OF LINDISFARNE,
AND OTHER CHRISTIAN MONUMENTS OF
NORTHUMBRIA. With Philological Chap-
ters by A. BLYTH WEBSTER, M.A.,
Berry Professor of English Literature, St
Andrews University


*With numerous illustrations, founded on the
writer's original photographs, some of them
being reproductions in colour*

THE FINE ARTS

THE ORIGIN, AIMS, AND CONDITIONS OF
ARTISTIC WORK AS APPLIED TO PAINTING,
SCULPTURE AND ARCHITECTURE

Fourth Edition. With Illustrations





Western Tower, Earls Barton, Northamptonshire.

THE ARTS IN EARLY ENGLAND

15000

By G. BALDWIN BROWN, M.A., LL.D., F.B.A.

HONORARY FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE, OXFORD

WATSON GORDON PROFESSOR OF FINE ART

IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

* *



ANGLO-SAXON ARCHITECTURE

A NEW EDITION ENTIRELY RECAST AND ENLARGED
WITH THIRTY FULL PAGE PLATES
ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-ONE ILLUSTRATIONS IN THE TEXT
AND A MAP OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF SAXON CHURCHES

709.4
B

G 1858
JAN 178/25
~~G 1858~~

LONDON
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET

1925

First Edition April, 1903

Second Edition 1925

Printed in Great Britain by T. and A. CONSTABLE LTD.
at the University Press, Edinburgh

PREFACE

THE MAIN feature in which this volume in its new issue differs from its predecessor is its historical form, the reason of which is explained in the Introductory Chapter. Another distinction that was inevitable is its increased size. This is due in part to the material discoveries of the last five and twenty years, and in part also to the results of more recent studies and investigations on the general subject of the book. The number of examples that have to be reviewed has increased, and the points of interest they present have come out into clearer light. Such points of interest are largely questions about details and these demand intensive study, so that the field is not only widened but needs to be ploughed more deeply. In more than one passage of the text emphasis is laid on the importance of a close scrutiny of details. In Saxon buildings these details are extremely varied, and are often curiously devised so that their genesis and *raison d'être* are obscure. It is however necessary to observe them closely for it is just these details that give its special character to this phase of the national art. As will be made clear in what follows, the strictly architectural qualities in Anglo-Saxon monuments are of little account. Of a Saxon architectural 'style' we cannot really speak, for the operations of the Saxon builder are of an unsystematic character. On the other hand the resultant productions exhibit their own aesthetic qualities the chief of which is a certain rude strength and dignity, while a minor quality is just this unexpectedness in the smaller forms. Hence we recognize in the work the outcome of the individuality of designers and craftsmen, who have not been

trained in the grammar of their art but express themselves in forms that are either creations of their own fancy, or reproduce more or less effectively something seen or heard of elsewhere. The trained architectural scholar may not feel any natural attraction towards the study of these rather amateurish essays, but the volume is not addressed solely or mainly to such scholars, but to all who take a human and historical as well as a technical interest in the aims and achievements in building of the remoter forefathers of the English race.

From the first the series of volumes of which this is one has been addressed as much to the general public as to those whose interests are scholarly, and to a public moreover wider than that constituted by the incident of British birth, for to our kinsfolk from the Dominions and to independent offshoots from the common Anglo-Saxon stock there is a perennial attractiveness in the English country villages where, or near which, the subject matter of these volumes for the most part exists or has come to light. There is indeed no possession of the British race endowed with a charm more intimate, more essentially our own, than the English country village, and there are numberless rural hamlets where nature and man have worked in concert to fill the place with a mellowed beauty, that, after all, win their chief claim to praise from the perfect setting they provide for the country church.

The country church, happily as a rule still mediaeval and unspoiled, possesses often great intrinsic beauty in form and details and as such is naturally attractive to the architectural student, whom we have figured as turning with distaste from what he will call Anglo-Saxon crudities. It must be remembered however that the rural oratory of Saxon date is the beginning of what has grown through the later centuries to beauty on the spot where this oratory first arose. In many cases—the cases noted in this volume number nearly two hundred and forty—this simple shrine survives in part in the later fabric, and in any case it is linked with it in historical

continuity and bound to it moreover by waves of poetic sentiment that are still in radial contact with the receptive heart. If the reader can feel in some degree the glamour with which this long unbroken history has invested the spot where the village shrine has stood for a thousand years, he will be in less danger of finding the following pages wearisome.

The present book may in a sense be said to fall into three parts, or at any rate to have three distinct but collateral aims. It starts, after some preliminary explanations, with a simple account of the principal features of Saxon architecture such as will be of use to those who are interested in the subject but beginners in the study of it. This part may be passed over by the architectural student to whom it may seem elementary, but such a one will find in the body of the text matter to which his critical attention may with all respect be confidently invited. In this, its principal part, the book differs greatly from its predecessor of the first issue, for though the descriptions of the buildings, when there has been no change in the Saxon part of them, remain practically the same, yet they are arranged on an entirely different scheme the basis of which is chronological. The location in time of the principal monuments, and their grouping from the evolutionary standpoint, is here the chief aim, and the writer offers this attempt at a history to the friendly criticism of his fellow workers, while indulging the secret thought that, though he cannot expect from them general agreement, those who know most about the subject will be most sympathetic in judgement, as they are best aware of the curious difficulties that in connection with this phase of our architecture attend the balancing of the various items of evidence. These seem often perversely contradictory, and in 'placing' some of our prominent Saxon monuments, when every reasonable care has been taken to let all the evidence speak so that a conclusion may be established, some little antagonistic fact will spring with malicious intent to light and the whole will be immersed again in uncertainty.

The historical treatment thus essayed involves a discussion of a selected set of monuments of outstanding importance viewed in their relations of time and of style, and occupies Chapters iv to XIII, but this discussion does not carry the reader to the end of the volume, for a long final chapter in smaller type is devoted to a handling of the main theme from another point of view. The original volume ended with what was termed an Appendix containing an Alphabetical List of all the Saxon examples in the country known at the time to the writer, but on this list there were only the names of the examples with references to the pages of the text where any of them may have been mentioned. When there had been no mention the name alone was given with a brief indication of the amount of Saxon work remaining. After the publication of the volume the writer received many letters from clergymen and others interested in particular examples expressing regret that on these more had not been said, and in consequence in the present edition the mere list has grown to a catalogue raisonné in which each example is made the subject of a concise critical description. This has again added considerably to the contents of the volume, but has on the one hand imparted a certain completeness to the survey, and on the other has given the opportunity to deal with several points of real interest the discussion of which would have overburdened the main text. Hence this Chapter xiv is not to be regarded merely as an Appendix, but as an extension of the text of the book in which the historical standpoint is relinquished and the only aim is completeness and as far as possible accuracy of survey. To secure this enquiries were naturally directed to rectors and vicars of churches on the list, as to any changes in the Saxon parts of these which the last quarter of a century may have witnessed, and where the reply suggested the need for a visit of inspection this was duly paid by the writer, who has also revisited sometimes more than once examples that are of special interest. It is hoped that in this way the information has been

brought fairly up to date. Opportunity is here taken to thank the numerous correspondents among the clergy who were thus approached for the unfailing courtesy and care which they have shown in their replies. These have been in many cases accompanied by a copy of some useful local monograph with the history and description of a church, that shows how much interest is being taken in these lovely and venerable monuments by those in chief charge of them.

The whole number of churches on this Alphabetical List is now nearly two hundred and forty as against one hundred and eighty-two in the older edition, so that the subject may be said to be at any rate not standing still. That the examples on the present list are all the churches in the country that contain, or even all those that exhibit, Saxon building, is not for a moment pretended, and a systematic combing-through of all the districts, such as is being carried out in the home counties by the Ancient Monuments Commission, would certainly increase considerably the number for any future reckoning.

The interval since 1903 has been marked by some considerable literary activity in connection with our subject. The most important item is the section devoted to Saxon architecture in Commendatore Rivoira's interesting volumes *Lombardic Architecture*.¹ The treatment here is systematic, where possible documented, and well illustrated by photographs reproduced in half-tone. The number of examples adduced is of course limited, and the attributions of them to the various dates suggested have always reasons at their back. On the whole these dates correspond fairly well with those proposed in the following pages, though in some cases the writer's judgement differs from that of the accomplished Italian scholar. Nothing else has appeared of so comprehensive a kind. The French works on the mediaeval period so often referred to in the text, the *Architecture Religieuse, Periode Romane*,² of R. de Lasteyrie, and the *Manuel d'Archéologie Française : Architecture*

¹ English translation, two vols., London, 1910.

² Paris, 1912.

Religieuse,¹ of Camille Enlart, though their scope is pretty wide, are confined in the main to France, and the first named takes no account of the efforts at building 'd'outre-Manche.' M. Enlart however, who mentions Saxon architecture in the *Manuel*, does deal with it at some length in his contribution to André Michel's *Histoire de l'Art*, etc.,² Vol I, pp. 117-122, noticing that 'l'Angleterre . . . avant la Conquête avait, comme les autres nations occidentales, créé par ses propres moyens un style roman original, procédant des traditions romaines et de l'apport décoratif des Barbares.' In the great *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, edited by Dom F. Cabrol, the article 'Bretagne (Grande)' gives 56 columns to the subject with abundant illustrations, but this does not involve a personal treatment such as that by Rivoira, and most of the matter is drawn from the first edition of this volume. The same applies to the article 'Englische Baukunst' in Hoops's *Reallex. d. German. Altertumskunde*, Strassburg, 1911, etc.

Of the utmost importance is the treatment of the subject in the *Reports* of the English Ancient Monuments Commission, but as yet only those for Buckinghamshire, Herts, and Essex have been published; and only second in authority come the descriptions in the topographical sections of the volumes of the *Victoria History of the Counties of England*. Only however in the case of a few of the counties have these sections been reached. Bedfordshire, Hants, Herts and Surrey are complete and indexed. Lancashire, Worcester, and the N Riding of Yorkshire seem to have the topographical matter overtaken while in Bucks and Middlesex it is only begun.

Articles in *Archaeologia* and other antiquarian periodicals general and local, as well as in *The Builder* and other architectural journals, have furnished material duly noted in the text, but in the quest for Saxon churches previously passed over the writer has obtained the greatest assistance from private communications. Foremost among these was a documented

¹ Paris, 1902; 2^{me} édition, 1919.

² Paris, 1905, etc.

list of some hundred and fifty early churches not mentioned in the volume of 1903, which was most kindly handed over to the writer by Colonel H. E. Jessep, R.E., formerly in charge for a time of the Ordnance Survey of Scotland, and the author of two excellent booklets on the Saxon churches of Hampshire and Surrey,¹ and of Sussex.² The indications thus given in this and other welcome communications of the same order were of course followed up, but as is natural the majority of the churches named, though probably of the eleventh century, were not found on examination to exhibit the distinctive Saxon features. Of the numerous small county guides and books about county churches, which are a healthy sign of public interest in our rural scenes and monuments, it must be confessed that there is often observable an over-readiness to leap to the conclusion that because a church looks simple and early it can be put down as probably Saxon, whereas Saxon features and details are fairly distinct and should seldom be confused with Norman. Upton church near Didcot is a case in point. It was indicated to the writer from more than one quarter as pre-Conquest, whereas it is Norman in every aspect and feature.

The writer is indebted to Mr C. R. Peers, C.B.E., H.M. Chief Inspector of Ancient Monuments, for generously opening his well-furnished storehouse of monument lore, and communicating many examples from his own extended Anglo-Saxon list. Some of these indications were of special value. Later on, when Mr Peers has received his '*tabula honestae missionis*,' and there comes for him that period of fruitful activity which so often begins when a competent public servant is, in official terminology, 'retired,' it may be hoped that he will give out in permanent form the fruits of his life-long studies in this part of the national artistic history. Obligations are also acknowledged to other friends and correspondents too numerous to mention, and a special recognition is due to

¹ Winchester, Warren and Co., 1913.

² London, Simpkin, n.d.

the writer's friend of long standing, Mr John Bilson of Hull, whose balanced judgement and unfailing accuracy are a great stand-by, and whose advice and assistance have been of special value in connection with the relations between Saxon architecture and that of the Normans, on which latter subject Mr Bilson's authority stands so exceptionally high, not only in our own country but in France. A valued colleague, Mr Bruce Dickins, has kindly helped on points of Anglo-Saxon scholarship.

This will be the place to acknowledge with gratitude the gift of the illustration of Whittingham tower arch, Fig. 189, and permission to copy others, which has as usual been generously accorded by learned and official bodies, by publishers and editors, and by private individuals, and the writer specially thanks his wife, who has again taken pen in hand and drawn the originals of many of the new illustrations in this edition. The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland has kindly permitted a further use of the valuable Irvine papers and drawings, the British Archaeological Association, the Wiltshire Antiquarian Society, the proprietors of *The Builder*, and of the rights of the old *Reliquary*, have freely given leave for the copying of cuts in their publications, while the Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments in England cordially agreed to the writer's request that he might reproduce on his own scale a plan in their *Essex Report*. Here however the British Treasury intervened with a demand for a money payment, and the request was withdrawn, for one does not fee one's own Government for what is everywhere else accorded with the most perfect freedom and courtesy.

Such liberality and graciousness are happily in full evidence in the Ancient Monuments Department of the Office of Works, and members of its staff, from the Chief Officials downwards, always do their best to further the intention of Government in setting up the Monument Commissions, by giving help and encouragement to private individuals who with necessarily

limited equipment are doing their small share in a common work. It is really a duty of national moment to make understood and valued by local authorities and the public at large the priceless treasure that time has spared to us in our older buildings both monumental and domestic. The Ministry of Transport, one is glad to know from a recent communication in *The Times*,¹ is fully alive to this, and will divert a main road through a 'by-pass,' in place of the old policy still favoured by some public authorities of knocking down everything old that is in the way of a modern scheme.

The present volume, long as it is, necessarily omits much that should be included in any professedly full treatment of its theme. To take one example, apart from their architectural features Saxon churches retain to a degree not generally recognized fragments of decorative sculpture that are at times in structural connection with the fabric or had to it a demonstrable relation of the kind in the past. These are of course quite distinct from the carved fragments of churchyard crosses and similar stones that have been brought in from outside and stored in the churches, and that provide us with a continuous series of decorative carvings through all the Christian centuries of Saxondom. These carvings are as a rule more easily datable than are the churches, and the recent writings of W. G. Collingwood, F.S.A., on Yorkshire and other northern districts, have greatly advanced their study. Now when more or less datable stones of this kind can be brought into relation with carved architectural fragments that are parts of Saxon churches we may secure valuable criteria of date for those churches. An excellent illustration is Kirby Hill, by Borough-bridge, Yorkshire, where the featureless Saxon masonry of the nave taken by itself has been put down, both in the first edition of this book, and in the *Victoria History*, to the eleventh century. Here however there still remains apparently in situ the enriched impost of the S door, the carved work on which is

¹ December 24, 1924.

much earlier, so that on the strength of this detail the date of the fabric can be put back a couple of centuries. In the following pages this kind of evidence has where possible been invoked, but fully to exploit it would have demanded more space than was available. Saxon architectural sculpture in general might however with advantage be taken up and systematically surveyed as a study subsidiary to the more purely architectural treatment.

Another and more important subsidiary study is that of the original documents of the Anglo-Saxon and Early Norman periods in their bearing on architectural history. What is required here is a compilation like that drawn up for the history of Carolingian art by Dr Julius Schlosser, where all passages in the records of the time bearing on the arts are brought together in a convenient series of extracts after the fashion of Overbeck's well known *Schriftquellen* for classical art. Account has of course been taken of literary evidence in these chapters, most fully in the case of Hexham in Chapter vi, but much more remains to be done. Mr Page, the editor of the Victoria County Histories, has published in Vol. LXVI. of *Archaeologia* a valuable paper on Domesday evidence in the matter of churches, and Professor Stenton, of University College, Reading, in connection with the Domesday Records for Lincolnshire, has thrown welcome light on the vexed question of the date of the so-called 'Lincolnshire' towers. Not so long ago a well known writer on Anglo-Saxon architecture, the late Loftus Brock, F.R.I.B.A., dated towers like St Peter-at-Gowts or St Mary-le-Wigford at Lincoln in the tenth century, but more recently they have been reckoned very late and even post-Conquest. Mr Stenton has now shown that the social condition of the county soon after the Conquest explains how it is that buildings so obviously Anglo-Saxon may yet in date belong to the Norman era. In a private communication he has kindly pointed out that 'conditions in Lincolnshire were quite different after 1066 from their earlier state,' and he

points to a Norman bishop, a man of unusual energy, resident in the county, and in touch with the new lords of manors who were much wealthier as a rule than their pre-Conquest predecessors. On the whole too there was 'a quite different orientation of life—towards France rather than Scandinavia.' All this would naturally prepare us for an outburst of architectural activity inspired by the magnificent scheme of Remigius for the Early Norman west front of Lincoln. It is quite in accordance with historical likelihood that the numerous Lincolnshire churches and parts of churches of the eleventh century would find here their *raison d'être*, but what strikes one as unexpected is the fact that these buildings are not in the Norman style at all but are very characteristically Saxon. The direct influence of Lincoln west front is in evidence at Branston, see pp. 390, 445, but elsewhere it is generally confined to a volute capital here, an enriched tympanum there, or a moulding of distinctly Norman profile, while, as in the two Lincoln towers just mentioned, the proportions and general style of the building remain purely Saxon. Of this paradox a simple explanation may be found in the dearth of Norman masons over and above those engaged at Lincoln, but some further elucidation is furnished by what Professor Stenton has ascertained from his researches about the intense conservatism of the men of Lincolnshire 'in law, social organization, agrarian life, personal nomenclature, and indeed in everything which gives a clue to their habits of mind.' 'That they should also' he concludes 'show conservatism in architecture seems most natural. And they were so exceptionally rich (in comparison with the Derby-Notts-Leicester people) that they could afford to build solidly, so that much of their work has lasted.' This is all of course of great interest, and it is specially significant in view of the discussion of the 'Saxo-Norman overlap' in Chapter XIII, for Saxon forms, as will be argued in the text, did not only survive because there were not enough Norman masons to produce something better, but

because they possessed a solid basis in the older traditions of the land, that enabled them to hold their own even when the surroundings were dominated by such imposing structures as were then rising on Lincoln Hill. It is quite possible that other points of controversy about the dating of Saxon buildings may receive elucidation from fresh historical and social evidence collected in this way from the records, and here again is a promising field of work for the younger Anglo-Saxon enthusiast.

A third subsidiary study is one referred to earlier in this Preface—the study of architectural features and details. Many of the pages that follow are devoted to these but more might easily have been filled. The obvious fact that questions concerning these features and details have as a rule but slight architectural importance is beside the mark. Small things are not ignored by modern science, and puzzles upon the solution of which nothing of moment depends may have the quality expressed by the useful word ‘intriguing,’ and may tease us till the answer be found. The philosophy of the curious appearance in arches known as ‘horseshoeing’ is worth elucidating, and one would give something to learn the exact early history of the ‘long and short’ quoins so common in later Anglo-Saxon buildings, or to smooth out the rather tangled problem of the various forms of baluster shafts used throughout the period. What is said in the text on these and other minor but attractive themes has been carefully thought out, but makes no pretence to finality, and this is the key to the writer’s own view of his work. The intrinsic value of the treatment of the subject that follows must be left to the intelligent reader to determine, but the book will best fulfil the purpose of its author if it be found, not only fairly to represent the existing state of knowledge on the subject, but to provide a starting point and a stimulus to younger workers in the same field. To many it will always be an attractive field, and if these pages allure to it any labourer ready to wield the proverbial spade they will have achieved the best that could be


hoped from them. Such 'spade work' may prepare the way for an advanced treatment of the whole theme in the future.

A branch of investigation which has not been attempted here is the influence of Anglo-Saxon forms on the ecclesiastical architecture of Scandinavia. This may be commended to future workers, and a recent study in *Fornvännen* for 1924, by Dr Bengt Thordeman, on the very Saxon-looking church of St Peter in the antique Swedish town of Sigtuna, may serve as a timely stimulus.

A postscript is needed for some minor points of practice. There has been maintained the convention used in the last three volumes by which centuries are indicated simply by bold Roman numerals, VI, X, etc., obvious prepositions being sometimes understood. A further saving of space has been obtained by using N S E W in similar fashion for the points of the compass, a plan adopted in the *Reports* of the English Monuments Commission. In the interest of clearness, references to the pages of the present volume are given throughout, up to Chapter xiv, in brackets, thus (p. 100). In the footnotes *Arch.* stands for *Archaeologia*, *Arch. Journ.* for the *Journal* of the Archaeological Institute, and *Ass.* for that of the British Archaeological Association. There are practically three Indices, for the Alphabetical List that occupies Chapter xiv serves as Index to the Saxon Churches, and it is followed by an Index of Saxon architectural features and details that may be found useful by the enquiring student. In this connection it may be mentioned that two points on which a fairly full treatment might have been expected are passed over lightly for a reason given below. These are the questions (1) of topographical distribution and (2) of statistics. It may be asked in what district or districts and at what epochs particular features such as apses, side aisles, or western doors, or details like hollow chamfers or soffit rolls, are found in use, and some investigators set great store by appropriate answers. In the

present volume however, though such indications of period and locality are where possible offered, no special attention is paid to this statistical side of the study. It is believed that the survival of Anglo-Saxon examples is so accidental, that even full and accurate statistics drawn from existing facts would only give uncertain general results. Hence though these statistics may be gathered from the entries of Index II, as from other parts of the volume, there has been no attempt to formulate them. Index III is of the general kind and, in so far as strictly architectural matter is concerned, it is complementary to Index II, for, while the latter is confined to material exclusively Saxon, the General Index takes a somewhat wider range, and recognizes Roman, Celtic, Norman, and other work that has a relation to Saxon. All references to books and periodicals are given in Index III, and the same is the case with proper names, among which, in accordance with the previous practice in these volumes, names of living persons have not been included.

The plans, with one or two exceptions noticed when they occur, are all drawn to the same scale, and as they appear on the page are to the scale of one-sixteenth of an inch to a foot. The absolute and the comparative dimensions of the buildings discussed can be obtained from the plans ; and in this connection the subjoined scale of feet may be found useful.



This Preface cannot end without a grateful recognition of the taste and precision of the University Press of Edinburgh in carrying through a work involving some special care in typography.

THE UNIVERSITY, EDINBURGH,
March, 1925.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	PAGE V
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	XXV

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY	I
Differences between the present and the former edition, 1. Conditions and limitations of the present historical treatment, 3.	

CHAPTER II

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS	7
Classes of Saxon monuments; mainly churches, 7. Statistics of the churches, 10. Churches in Domesday, 13. Saxon crosses, fonts, and sundials, 14. Distribution of the examples, 17. Saxon criteria, 19. Proportions, 20. Plinths, 23. Quoins, 24. Door and window openings, 26.	

CHAPTER III

THE SOURCES OF EARLY ANGLO-SAXON ARCHITECTURE	38
The timber tradition; slight and solid wood technique; Greenstead in Essex, 38. Stone tradition from two sources Celtic and Roman; early Irish oratories and their possible influence on Saxon construction and technique, 42. Roman forms and materials; treatment of jambs and quoins, 48. Columns, 58. The basilica at Silchester, 61. Arch construction, 65. Thin Saxon walling of Roman derivation, 68.	

CHAPTER IV

EARLY CHURCHES OF THE KENTISH GROUP PAGE 73

Canterbury churches, 73. Christ Church, 76. St Martin, 80. St Pancras, 82. St Peter and St Paul, abbey church of St Augustine, 86. Meanings of the word 'Porticus,' 89. Rochester, Lyminge, Reculver, 95. St Peter-on-the-Wall, Essex, 101. Brixworth, 104. Stone-by-Faversham, 116. Abingdon, 116.

CHAPTER V

THE NORTHUMBRIAN GROUP OF EARLY MONUMENTS 119

Monkwearmouth, 120. Question of its date, 128. Jarrow, 133. Escomb, 136. Roman chancel arch, 137. Corbridge, 142. York as described by Alcuin, 146. Ripon, 148.

CHAPTER VI

HEXHAM AND WILFRID 149

Wilfrid's work at Hexham, 149. The literary notices, 151. History of the site, 155. Existing remains on the site, 160. The crypts at Hexham and Ripon, 161. Recent investigations and discoveries, 165. Conjectural scheme of Wilfrid's basilica, 168. Wilfrid's 'central' church, 181. Beginnings of relic worship, 183.

CHAPTER VII

SOME POSSIBLE EIGHTH OR EARLY NINTH CENTURY CHURCHES 185

Decline of Northumbria and rise of Mercia; Mercian architecture, 185. Heysham Chapel, Saxon or Irish? 187. Somerford Keynes, 189. Sockburn-on-Tees, 191. Bardsey in Elmet, 191. Towers built above porches, 193. Typical porch, Bishopstone, 193. Titchfield, 194.

CHAPTER VIII

THE VIKING AGE 195

Effect of the Viking raids on Architecture; Activity of St Swithun, 195. Alfred's buildings at Athelney, etc., 196. Norse influence

CONTENTS

xxi

PAGE

on decoration; Norse timber work; the 'Stavkyrker,' 196. Saxon stone forms not imitated from woodwork, 198. Saxon church towers not military, 199. High walls and small windows conditioned by the circumstances of the Danish wars, 201. Carved stones as criteria of date, Hackness and Kirby Hill, 203. Projecting heads of monsters at Deerhurst, 205. Carved vine ornament at Britford, 207. Deerhurst Church, plan, arrangements and details, 208. Carved angel in wall of apse, 218. Britford and its lateral chapels, 220.

CHAPTER IX

INFLUENCES FROM THE RHINELAND AND SAXONY . . . 227

Neustrian and Austrasian Franks, Merovingian influence on Saxon England succeeded by that of the Carlings and the Old Saxons, 227. Austrasian influence on Saxon church planning; importance of Aachen, 230. The western tower, 235. Treatment of wall surfaces, 238. The pilaster strip and the buttress; the Lisenen, 238. Decorative wall facings, Roman and Gallic, 243. Herring-bone work a Norman feature, 244. Window openings; subdivision of these; mid-wall shafts and imposts; recessing, 246. Double splayed single openings, 251. Details; the cubical cap and its history, 252. Step-pattern mouldings, 255. Long and short quoins, 256. The baluster shaft in its various forms, 257.

CHAPTER X

THE REVIVAL OF THE TENTH CENTURY AND THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE THIRD PERIOD . . . 267

Ramsey Abbey, what have we to show of the kind? 268. Churches on seals, 269. Character of tenth century work, 271. Barnack Tower, its carved ornament, internal arrangements, tower arch, imposts, 273. Step-patterns generally, 279. Earls Barton Tower, most noteworthy of Saxon movements; details and openings of the tower, 283. Barton-on-Humber, its plan and arrangement; type of church with its main area the ground story of a tower, 288. Example of the same at Broughton, and perhaps Hough-on-the-Hill, 291. Bradford-on-Avon, its proportions and porches; external arcading, 296. Carved angel from a Rood, 303.

CHAPTER XI

SOME DATABLE THIRD PERIOD CHURCHES . . .	PAGE 306
--	-------------

Greenstead ; Hadstock, date not attested, 306. Deerhurst Chapel, 307. Kirkdale, 308. Boarhunt, 309. S Elmham, 310. Repton, 312. Saxon crypts, 320. Basilican churches, Lydd, 320. Wing and its crypt; Sidbury, 323.

CHAPTER XII

ARCHITECTURE IN THE THIRD PERIOD: THE USES OF TOWERS AND 'PORTICUS' AND THEIR DISPOSITION IN RELATION TO CHURCH PLANS . . .	325
---	-----

Résumé of chronological results, 325. The evolution of ground plans, 327. The western porch, 329. The porch surmounted by a tower, 330. Internal arrangements in western towers, 330. Apertures facing externally, 337. Arrangements in axial, lateral, and central towers, 340. Thickening of walls for towers, 342. Central towers and the cruciform scheme, 348. Breamore, 350. Dover, 353. Stow, 354. Norton, 356. Stanton Lacy, 359. Wootton Wawen, 360. Worth, cruciform without central tower, 362. Some advanced churches; Hadstock; Great Paxton, 365. Summary on planning, 372.

CHAPTER XIII

THE SAXO-NORMAN OVERLAP . . .	377
-------------------------------	-----

The introduction of Norman influence, 378. Saxon and Norman architecture at the Conquest, 379. Greater churches and the use of columns, 382. Village churches, Saxon and Norman, 383. Saxon western towers especially of the 'Lincolnshire' type, 386. Their general form, 387. Architectural treatment, 389. Finish at top, 391. Western and other doorways and their treatment, 394. Recessing, 397. Soffit shafts and rolls, 398. Clayton, Wittering, Bosham, Stoughton, etc., 399. Small openings, 402. Tower arches, 402. Jambs and imposts, Whittingham, Barholme, etc., 404. The belfry and its openings, 407. Mid-wall shafts and caps, 407. Tectonic and volute capitals, 409. Evolution of the cubical and scalloped cap, 410. Caps of cylindrical or spherical origin, 414. Saxons and Normans in co-operation, 416. Ex-

CONTENTS

xxiii

PAGE

amples of the overlap in Yorkshire, 420. The situation in East Anglia, 422. Norman tolerance of Saxon forms, 428. Possible continuance of Austrasian influence, 429. Sompting, 430. Bosham, 435.

CHAPTER XIV

(FORMING INDEX I)

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF SAXON CHURCHES WITH CONCISE NOTES ON EACH AND INDICATIONS OF DATE . 438

INDEX II

ARCHITECTURAL INDEX OF SAXON FEATURES AND DETAILS 491

INDEX III

GENERAL INDEX 501

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIG.		PAGE
	Western Tower, Earls Barton, Northamptonshire	<i>Frontispiece</i>
1.	Norman herring-bone work at Tamworth	8
2.	Comparative chart of the proportions of Saxon churches	21
3.	Plinths of Anglo-Saxon walls	22
4.	Quoin stones of S transept, Stow, Lincolnshire	22
5.	Quoin of nave, St Mildred, Canterbury	24
6.	Long and short quoin, Rockland All Saints, Norfolk	24
7.	Pilaster strips at Woolbeding, Sussex	25
8.	Doorway at Diddlebury, Salop	26
9.	Tower arch, Market Overton, Rutland	27
10.	Chancel arch, Stainton-by-Tickhill, Yorks.	27
11.	Tower arch, Brigstock, Northants	28
12.	Opening in tower at Brigstock, Northants	30
13.	Window with sloping jambs, Brigstock	31
14.	Window in nave, Worth, Sussex	33
15.	Subdivided opening at Barton-on-Humber	34
16.	Comparative plans of window openings	36
17.	Avebury, double splayed circular lights	37
18.	NW corner of timber church at Greenstead, Essex	40
19.	Plan of NW corner at Greenstead	41
20.	Early Irish oratory, Skellig Michael, Ireland	42
21.	Plans of single-celled oratories	43
22.	Plan of early oratory with altar house, Friar's Island, Killaloe	44
23.	Plans of normal early Irish churches	45
24.	Oratory on St Macdara's Island, Ireland	48
25.	Jamb of Roman gateway, Chesters, on the N Tyne	49
26.	Roman doorway at Chesters	50
27.	Tooling on Roman stones in the Northumberland Wall	51
28.	Roman archway at Pola in Istria	52

FIG.		PAGE
29.	Byzantine doorway in Parthenon, Athens	53
30.	Chancel arch at Escomb, Durham	54
31.	Long and short work, Wittering, Northants	56
32.	Roman shaft in Saxon tower, Wickham, Berks	60
33.	Roman dwarf pillar, Housesteads, Northumberland	60
34.	Plan of Early Christian church, Silchester	61
35.	Jamb of opening at Britford, Wilts	66
36.	Springing of arch at Brixworth	67
37.	Arch at Ampney St Peter, Gloucestershire	67
38.	Arch at Wootton Wawen, Warwickshire	68
39.	Slight Roman wall at Chesters	69
40.	Saxon wall at Sockburn-on-Tees	69
41.	Saxon cathedral at Canterbury	77
42.	Plan of St Martin, Canterbury	81
43.	Plan of St Pancras, Canterbury	83
44.	General Plan of new discoveries at St Augustine, Canterbury	91
45.	Sketch at St Augustine excavations, July, 1923	94
46.	Plan of Early Saxon church at Rochester	96
47.	Plan of Saxon work at E end of Reculver Church	98
48.	Part of the S wall of St Peter, Bradwell, Essex	103
49.	Brixworth Church, Northants, from SW	107
50.	Plan of Brixworth Church	108
51.	Sections at E end at Brixworth	111
52.	Interior view of Brixworth, looking W	112
53.	Brixworth Tower at level of triple opening	115
54.	Masonry at Stone-by-Faversham, Kent	116
55.	Plan of Monkwearmouth Church	121
56.	W tower of Monkwearmouth Church	122
57.	W doorway of porch, Monkwearmouth	123
58.	S jamb of doorway to porch, Monkwearmouth	125
59.	Turned shaft from Monkwearmouth porch	125
60.	W wall of nave, Monkwearmouth	127
61.	Plan of Escomb Church, Durham	137
62.	View of Escomb Church from SE	138
63.	Interior view of Escomb Church, Durham	139
64, A.	N doorway of nave, Escomb, interior view }	140
B.	N doorway of nave, Escomb, exterior view }	

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

xxvii

FIG.

PAGE

65, A. Round headed window, Escomb	141
B. Square headed window, Escomb	
66. Plan of porch at Corbridge, Northumberland	142
67. W portal, Corbridge	144
68. Crypts at Ripon and at Hexham	162
69. Plan of Hexham Priory Church as re-constituted after 1907	166
70. { Plan of Hexham before re-constitution	167
71. { Do., with conjectural plan of Wilfrid's church	
72. Plan of Early Saxon church at Peterborough	169
73. Ancient pontifical chair in Hexham Priory Church	178
74. Gable ornaments and a Deerhurst capital	188
75. Doorways, A, at Heysham Chapel, Lancs. }	190
B, at Somerford Keynes, Wilts }	
76. Plan of Saxon porch and W end of nave, Bardsey, Yorks.	192
77. View of Bishopstone Church, Sussex	193
78. Bishopstone porch	194
79. Jarrow windows	203
80. Hackness impost and pieces for comparison	205
81. Projecting head at Deerhurst	206
82. Head at Deerhurst, ornament at Britford	207
83. Plan of Saxon church at Deerhurst	209
84. View of Deerhurst Church from SW	210
85. Bowl of Deerhurst font	212
86. Opening in W wall of nave, Deerhurst	214
87. Carved angel from wall of apse, Deerhurst	219
88. Plan of Saxon portion of Britford Church, Wilts	221
89. Jamb and springing of S arch, Britford, Wilts	223
90. Soffit of N arch, Britford, Wilts	223
91. W end of Minster at Aachen, after C. Rhoen	234
92. Section of W end at Aachen	235
93. Pilaster strips and buttresses compared	240
94. Pilaster strip at Breamore, Hants	241
95. Details at Gernode and Earls Barton compared	242
96. 'Thorhalle' at Lorsch, Germany	242
96 bis. A, Double splayed window at Diddlebury, Salop }	245
B, Herring-bone facing to N wall at Diddlebury }	
97. Mid-wall shaft and corbel cap at Trier	247

FIG.		PAGE
98.	Methods of dividing a double opening	250
99.	Double splayed window at Trier	252
100.	Accidental long and short quoining	257
101.	Baluster shafts at Jarrow and Monkwearmouth	258
102.	Detail from Roman altar at Birrens	259
103.	Astragal on Roman stone at Hexham	260
104.	Carved stone from Hexham	260
105.	Carved stone from Jarrow	261
106.	Baluster from opening at W end of Brixworth	262
107.	Balusters, A, from Barton-on-Humber, B, from Earls Barton	262
108.	Mid-wall shaft from E opening at Wing, Bucks	264
109.	Shaft from tower opening at Bardsey, Yorks.	264
110.	Turned baluster shafts at St Albans	265
111.	Turned shafts in the Museum, Dover	266
112.	Seal representing the Saxon cathedral at Exeter	269
113.	Matrix of Chichester Seal	270
114.	Transenna with pierced ornament from Barnack	274
115.	Carved slabs from Barnack Tower, Northants	275
116.	Enriched Saxon sundial from Corhampton, Hants, and Roman baluster shaft from relief at York	276
117.	View of Barnack Tower from SW	277
118.	Plan of Barnack Tower	277
119.	View from nave into ground story of Barnack Tower	278
120.	Impost of Barnack Tower arch	279
121.	Step-pattern mouldings of various Saxon dates	281
122.	Plan of Earls Barton Tower, Northamptonshire	284
123.	W doorway, Earls Barton Tower	286
124.	Plan of part of belfry stage, Earls Barton Tower	287
125.	Barton-on-Humber Church as now seen	288
126.	W wall of nave, Barton-on-Humber	290
127.	Plan of original Saxon church, Barton-on-Humber	291
128.	Original form of Saxon church, Barton-on-Humber	291
129.	Saxon gable cross from Corbridge Church	291
130.	Tower, formerly chancel, arch at Broughton near Brigg, Lincs., W face	292
131.	The same, E face	293
132.	Plan, and section of nave, at Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts	296

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

xxix


FIG.	PAGE
133. Saxon church at Bradford-on-Avon, from NE	298
134. Pilasters, arcading, etc., on the exterior of Bradford-on-Avon	300
135. Arcading in interior of nave, Dunham Magna, Norfolk	301
136. Carved angel from Bradford-on-Avon	304
137. Earl Odda's Chapel at Deerhurst	307
138. View of Boarhunt Church, Hants	308
139. Plan of Boarhunt Church	309
140. Window in chancel at Boarhunt	310
141. Plan of the 'Old Minster' at S Elmham, Suffolk	311
142. Plan of the Saxon portion of Repton Priory Church	313
143. Plan of Repton crypt	314
144, A. Column in Repton crypt }	315
B. Top of pilaster strip, Repton }	
145. Saxon remains at Lydd Church, Kent	321
146. Eastern end with crypt at Wing	322
147. Wing Church, Bucks, from NE	323
148. Crypt at Sidbury, Devon	324
149. Recess in tower chamber, Skipwith, Yorks.	333
150. W end of nave, Bosham, Sussex	334
151. W ends of three Saxon churches	335
152. Netheravon Tower, Wilts	338
153. Belfry stage, Great Hale, Lincolnshire	339
154. Section of tower and W adjunct, Barton-on-Humber	341
155. Plan of N Elmham, Norfolk	344
156. Dunham Magna, Norfolk, from NW	346
157. Plan of Dunham Magna Church	347
158. Plan of Breamore, Hants	349
159. Breamore Church from SW	350
160. Inscribed archway into S chapel, Breamore	351
161. Plan of St Mary, Dover Castle	352
162. above, St Mary, Dover Castle, with Pharos, from W }	354
below, Stanton Lacy, Salop, N wall and N transept }	
163. Plan of central part of Stow, Lincolnshire	356
164. View of Norton Church, Durham	357
165. Plan of central portion at Wootton Wawen, Warwickshire	361
166. Worth Church, Sussex, from SE	362
167. Plan of Worth Church, Sussex	363

FIG.		PAGE
168.	W jamb of S transept opening, Hadstock, Essex . . .	366
169.	Enriched cresting on top of jamb of N doorway, Hadstock . . .	367
170.	Detail of ornament on cresting at Hadstock . . .	367
171.	Jamb of E respond, S arcade, Great Paxton, Hunts. . .	369
172.	Cruciform plan at S. Nazaro Grande, Milan . . .	374
173.	Plan of early church at St Denis, showing 'I' form . . .	374
174.	Roman and Saxon columns . . .	384
175.	W tower, St Peter-at-Gowts, Lincoln . . .	388
176.	Tower of Clapham Church, near Bedford . . .	389
177.	Arcading at base of W tower, Branston, Lincolnshire . . .	390
178.	Big stone quoining at Lusby, Lincolnshire . . .	391
179.	Quoining at Duntisbourne Rous, Gloucestershire . . .	392
180.	Upper parts of two Saxon and one Norman tower . . .	393
181.	Blocked doorways with tympana filled in . . .	394
182.	Doorways in Cotswold churches . . .	395
183.	Doorway from Clee Church, Lincolnshire . . .	396
184.	Saxon doorways with recessed jambs and angle shafts . . .	397
184 bis.	From S door to nave, Stopham Church, Sussex . . .	398
185.	Plan of jamb of chancel arch at Clayton, Sussex . . .	399
186.	View and plan of jamb of chancel arch, Wittering, Northants . . .	400
187.	Lower part of N jamb of chancel arch, Bosham, Sussex . . .	401
188.	Keyhole loop, W face of tower, Clee, Lincolnshire . . .	402
189.	Tower arch at Whittingham, Northumberland . . .	404
190.	Enriched impost on jamb of tower arch, Whittingham . . .	404
191.	Some enriched imposts . . .	405
192.	Capitals on mid-wall shafts in W towers of the 'Lincolnshire' type . . .	408
193.	Tectonic capitals of cubical origin . . .	409
194.	Tectonic capitals of cylindrical or spherical origin . . .	415
195.	Arcade on S side of Ickleton Church, Cambs. . .	418
196.	Plan of Bessingham Church, Norfolk . . .	424
197.	Plan of Witton Church, Norfolk . . .	424
198.	Faulty arch technique . . .	425
199.	Jamb of doorway to nave, Stow, Lincs. . .	427
200.	Cap from W end, Schloss Kirche, Quedlinburg, Saxony . . .	430
201.	Impost of tower arch, Sompting, Sussex . . .	431
202.	Corbel caps at Trier and Sompting . . .	432
203.	Plan of Saxon church at Bosham, Sussex . . .	436

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

xxxi

FIG.		PAGE
204.	Bracebridge Church, near Lincoln	445
205.	Plan of earliest church at Dunfermline	452
206.	SE quoin of nave, Heddon-on-the-Wall, Northumberland	458
207.	Blocked window in nave of Iver Church, Bucks	461
208.	Plan and section of Whitfield Church, Kent	485
209.	Plan of Wittering Church, Northamptonshire	487
210.	Map showing the distribution of churches that exhibit remains of Saxon building	490



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

WHEN THIS volume first appeared it was not cast in the form of a history of Anglo-Saxon architecture. For this there were two reasons, one of which has now to a great extent lost its validity though the other remains still in force. The first reason was that the chronology of Anglo-Saxon buildings was at the time in a condition of comparative vagueness, and without a fixed chronological scheme a strictly historical treatment was impossible. This difficulty has now practically though not entirely disappeared, but the other difficulty remains, for it is due to the general nature of Anglo-Saxon work. In the artistic as well as in other fields this is wanting in consistency and system, and exhibits what in racing parlance would be called 'in-and-out running,' or an alternation of brilliant or at any rate promising achievement with crude and tentative production. Surprisingly good work may be quite early, and when we look for an advance on this we may find the later work inferior in style and craftsmanship. The difficulty that this sets in the way of placing works chronologically on the ground of their intrinsic qualities is a constant one that must always confront the Anglo-Saxon investigator.

In regard to the chronological problem the following was the position five and twenty years ago. The various buildings for which a pre-Conquest origin was claimed had been passed in review by older Victorian writers such as Rickman, Bloxam, and Parker, and had been subjected to a philosophic analysis in the well known article by Mr Micklethwaite in Vol. LIII of the *Archaeological Journal*, published in 1896 and

followed by a supplementary paper in Vol. lv. This treatment of the subject was highly illuminating from the points of view of the different types of Saxon buildings with their variations in plan and arrangement, but the limits of the article did not admit of a detailed study of the minor features of the monuments. In good truth it is on these minor features that chronological decisions largely depend, and as will be seen in the sequel they are the really determining facts which make it possible to subdivide into periods the five centuries of Anglo-Saxon building operations. The vagueness in architectural chronology already spoken of was partly due to a want of precision in distinguishing these characteristic details, such as the varying plans of window jambs, the methods of setting quoin stones, or the decorative treatment of wall faces, but it is also in part to be put down to a predilection for assuming a Roman or Italian origin for the constructive and decorative forms of our ancient buildings. Enough has been said in previous volumes of this work¹ about the curious British reluctance to believe that in artistic matters we can do anything good of ourselves, and also about the tendency to exaggerate the importance of Italy as the source of artistic fashions and ideas. In accordance with this predilection direct Italian prototypes were sought for the characteristic features of our Saxon buildings, and as the arts of building and decoration were of early development in the peninsula so our Anglo-Saxon work was very commonly dated unduly early on the assumption that it was derived immediately from Italy. Just as Italian prototypes have been evoked for our carved sepulchral crosses and slabs, so the characteristic Anglo-Saxon church tower was assimilated to the Italian Campanile and thrown back in date to the Early Christian centuries. Writing about 1845 Professor Willis² uses the words, 'that the Saxons did imitate Roman models

¹ e.g. Vol. i, 158 f., Vol. iii, 4 f.

² *Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral*, Lond., 1845, p. 30.

is shewn by the very mid-wall shafts of the Saxon windows which are directly copied from those of the Roman Campanili.' It will be made clear in the sequel that the Anglo-Saxon tower with its mid-wall shafts came to us by way of the Rhineland and Westphalia, where the W tower, not an Italian form, was evolved in the post-Carolingian epoch. From the same region we borrowed the mid-wall shafts, that had been imported from Italy into the Rhineland. From the old Italian obsession we have now to a great extent recovered, and there is perhaps some danger of our falling into a similar infatuation in regard to Syria and the nearer East.

A careful analysis of the details of buildings and a study of their history, combined with due caution about direct Italian influence, has made it possible to draw up a general scheme for the chronology of Anglo-Saxon architecture. Such a scheme offered itself as the outcome of the critical review of pre-Conquest buildings in their forms and their details which was contained in the first edition of this volume, but, whereas in 1903 it was still more or less a tentative scheme, the fact that to the writer's knowledge it has not been seriously called in question may be held to confer on it a patent of validity. On the basis therefore of this now established sequence of periods it is possible to treat the architecture of the Saxon period from the chronological point of view, and the chapters that follow are arranged in the main on a historical basis. It must at the same time be explained that the method adopted in the original issue of this volume cannot be wholly abrogated in favour of the chronological method. Saxon buildings cannot be properly grouped only in accordance with succession in point of time. Such succession in the first place can only be made out to a very limited extent. The original division, in the first edition, of the five centuries of Saxon building into three periods can be maintained. There is an Early Period, A, covering VII and most of VIII; an Intermediate Period, B, corresponding with the earlier and more

destructive Viking invasions and covering IX and the early part of X ; and a Third Period, C, beginning with the epoch of monastic revival in the last half of X and extending to the Norman Conquest, or even as we shall see, a little beyond it. Now in Period A chronology is easy, and thanks in great measure to Bede we can date and locate in VII quite a respectable number of monuments. For Period B, where this invaluable literary authority is no longer available, chronology is far more difficult, and it is an effort in argument to locate with proper assurance any single monument within its limits. In the Third Period of a century from about 970 onwards, especially in the later portion of it, the difficulty is so increased as to be really insuperable. As is obviously natural the great majority of existing examples are comparatively late in the style. They can be associated as members of a group and can all be shown to belong to the one tolerably extended Period C, but in what particular division of this period each example is to be located is of necessity uncertain.

Here comes in the second difficulty noticed at the beginning of this chapter, the somewhat uncertain and even haphazard nature of the Saxon efforts at architecture. Saxon builders produced architectural schemes and decorative details that are quite interesting, but these cannot be set in file, as if one grew out of another or at any rate followed it in a scheme of development. The logical evolution which is so marked a feature in the case of Norman architecture and which Viollet-le-Duc called its '*esprit de suite*,' as well as the tectonic sense of the relation of forms and details to structure are not in evidence in Saxendom. Many good architectural critics are so impressed with this immeasurable superiority in Norman work that they take no interest in that of the Saxon period, and wave it aside as merely barbarous. In this they are more Norman than the Normans themselves. These ruthless conquerors were quite fully conscious of the superiority of their own forms and methods, and the more important Saxon

buildings fared badly at their hands, but at the same time in lesser buildings they took over into their own practice some of the Saxon arrangements and details. In certain respects Norman architecture in this country differs from what we find in the Duchy at any rate in the pre-Conquest period, and this is largely due to the adoption of such Saxon forms as axial and western towers. When Saxon and Norman workmen collaborate, as happens in cases of what is termed the 'Saxo-Norman overlap,' explained in Chapter XIII, the former often keep to their old ways, and this shows that Saxon forms though used in a sporadic fashion had a firm hold upon practice which the new comers would at any rate tacitly recognize. For the further treatment of the point the reader is referred to Chapter XIII.

The historical method of treatment accordingly, quite in place in Period A is maintained in Period B, but in the later part of Period C the buildings are grouped as much in accordance with the particular uses they exhibit of Saxon forms and arrangements as in accordance with sequence in time which in too many cases there is really not evidence enough to establish. The question of this type or of that, rather than the question of older or younger, has then the first claim on our attention, though the other question is not neglected.

In connection with these Periods A, B and C, it may be noticed briefly, from the historical point of view, that in the first the work, though showing original or at any rate uncommon features, is based upon Romano-Christian models with a certain admixture from the Celtic side. Merovingian Gaul is the continental region that in this period is of account. In B the matter is too complicated for satisfactory summarization. In C things are clear again, and it will be shown that the work of this later period represented as is natural by the larger number of extant examples was to a great extent influenced by the architecture of post-Carolingian Rhineland and Saxony, regions with which the Anglo-Saxons were brought

at the time into contact. This is the old domain of the Austrasian, or eastern, Franks, and the affinity in certain features between later Saxon work and the work of that part of the Continent makes it tolerably evident that Anglo-Saxon England in this period of our architecture is a province, but a distinct and autonomous province, of Austrasian Romanesque.

CHAPTER II

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

THE OBJECT of the present chapter is to furnish such elementary knowledge of the forms and details of Anglo-Saxon buildings as may enable those interested in the subject to recognize the monuments when they see them, and to apprehend the special features that give them their place in the history of Early Christian and Early Mediaeval architecture as a whole.

The first volume of this work¹ contained some notice of the conditions under which were erected the monuments, ecclesiastical and secular, of the older England before the Norman Conquest. There were then mentioned military works in the form of town enceintes and entrenchments ; the mansions of kings and nobles and the humble dwellings of the burgher or villein ; churches of various kinds from the bishop's cathedral and the minster of the greater abbey to the minutest field church or chapel ; and finally subsidiary structures of ecclesiastical use attached to monastic or canonical establishments.

Of all these monuments of various classes the only ones that are still effectively represented are the churches. Saxon earthworks exist² but have no distinctive character and are in no way architectural. Some of the town enceintes were in masonry, and it is possible that some of the stones now visible in the extant ramparts of Exeter or Chester or Porchester may have been laid by Saxon hands. There are however in these cases no architectural details or technical

¹ *The Arts in Early England*, Lond., John Murray, 1903, Vol. I.

² e.g. Wareham, *ibid.*, p. 106, and Eddisbury, Cheshire, p. 107.

peculiarities to afford ground for identification. Two portions of existing castellated structures have been specially singled out as Saxon, and it will be well to make it clear that in both cases the work in question is Early Norman. One is a part of Corfe Castle on the outer enceinte W of the keep, where is a piece of walling forming one side of a former hall or chapel, that is obviously of different character from the rest of the structures on the hill. This however possesses all the characteristics of Norman work and has no shadow of

claim to be considered Saxon.

The other portion of masonry is at Tamworth and forms the facing of the embankment of access to the earthen mound on which stands the keep of Norman and later times.




FIG. 1, Early Norman herring-bone work, part of the facing of an embankment at Tamworth Castle. The stones are about 1 ft. in length.

The work at Tamworth is a particularly good example of the kind of masonry known as herring-bone work, which we shall have to establish as Norman rather than Anglo-Saxon.

This will be dealt with in its place (p. 243 f.), but it may be noted here that it consists in the laying of oblong stones (generally long thin ones), bricks, or flints, in a more or less upright position, in courses, with a marked slope alternately to the right and the left. Horizontal courses may come in between as in Fig. 1. As the moated mound in general is not to be regarded any longer as of pre-Conquest date,¹ this masonry connected with such a mound takes its place naturally as a Norman production.

Anglo-Saxon domestic structures in so far as they were of wood have not survived. The manor house of the period may however have been in part at least of stone, and the picture

¹ See Vol. I, p. 105 f.

of Harold's aula at Bosham in the Bayeux Tapestry may be quoted as evidence of this.¹ There is no reason why portions of pre-Conquest manor houses may not still exist embedded, as was the case with Deerhurst Chapel,² in later mediaeval structures, and investigation may yet bring some of these to light. In the neighbourhood of Selsey, Sussex, at Barton Farm, Pagham, some years ago an old aula was identified in a large farm house of later dates. It was entered through an arched doorway 3 ft. 1 in. wide, and measured about 19 ft. by 16 ft., with walls about 2 ft. thick, but the masonry was herring-boned and most probably Early Norman, though the thin wall might suggest an earlier date.

In the case of ecclesiastical monuments, though little or nothing in the way of subsidiary structures has been preserved, a very considerable number of churches are represented by extant fragments. Among these are included specimens of most of the classes into which Anglo-Saxon churches can be divided.³ There are bishops' churches, such as Rochester and Sherborne; churches of the greater abbeys, St Augustine at Canterbury, and Peterborough; monastic churches of lesser rank, such as Lyminge, Reculver, St Frideswide at Oxford, Monkwearmouth, Jarrow, Deerhurst; as well as collegiate churches of secular priests, for this was the status of Stow, Lincolnshire, after 1040, and may have been that of other examples. Most of these monastic and collegiate fanes descended afterwards to the rank of 'parish' churches in which character they have come down to us, and are partly town churches, in Cambridge, Colchester, Leicester, Lincoln, Norwich, York, etc., but are in the great majority of cases country or village fanes in their lovely rural surroundings. It should be understood at the outset that these extant monuments are nearly all buildings of the second order of importance, and it must not be assumed that they give an adequate idea of the achievements

¹ See Vol. I, p. 104.

² *ibid.*, p. 332, also the present Vol. (p. 307).

³ Vol. I, Ch. III.

of the Anglo-Saxon architect as a whole. To estimate the architecture of the period aright we have to take into account the literary notices of structures that have now perished, some of which were evidently of greater artistic pretension than any of the extant monuments. An estimate of Anglo-Saxon architecture on this broader basis will be found in later sections of this volume. For the moment we have to deal with the extant monuments alone.

Any list of such monuments will embrace a few examples that are still more or less completely Saxon, but the majority of the items must consist of little more than remains and indications that have had the good fortune to escape the ravages of time and the zeal of successive generations of builders. In reference to these the question may be asked whether it is really worth while to catalogue a number of fragments of old masonry accidentally preserved, simply on the ground that they belong to a specially early period of our architectural history?

It may be admitted that if this work be done merely in the spirit of the collector, it may easily degenerate into something like a 'fad.' To inventory and label so many hundred specimens of Saxon masonry as if they were postage stamps or beetles is not the proper way to deal with them. They have a human and historical as well as an architectural value, and this is not to be measured by the number of stones that make them up. A few cubic feet of walling are sufficient to establish for us on the spot a Saxon village church of stone, and this, with all its fittings and surroundings, its porch, its altar, its graveyard, was the centre of the social movements of that rural community that has remained till quite modern times the unit of the national life. It is a monumental link between ourselves and the older Britain of a millennium ago, and a point round which the patriotic imagination may fitly love to play. And further, these same few stones, when taken with other better preserved examples, may call up before

our minds a building that in plan and technique may present features of value which furnish material for at any rate an interesting footnote on the architectural history of the middle ages.

From this point of view nothing is really too small to notice. Fragments of moulding or carving or masonry, insignificant in themselves, may be like the one or two bones of the extinct animal, from which the palaeontologist can restore the whole organism. Such fragments moreover may supply chronological information of essential value, and may afford a means of correcting impressions derived from the general appearance and plan of a building. These last are in the Saxon period apt to mislead. Thus, for example, as a basilican church Wing, Bucks, seems naturally to take its place beside the seventh-century basilicas at Brixworth and Reculver, but as a fact, even apart from the advanced form of its crypt, Wing exhibits details that compel us to place it comparatively late. Bradford-on-Avon appears in general character a singularly early church, but when we observe its double splayed windows, and reckon up its pilaster strips and its arcading, we begin to distrust the impression of great antiquity. On the other hand, the general aspect of the church at Escomb in Durham suggested to Commendatore Rivoira a Romanesque rather than an Early Christian origin, but a detailed interrogation of the work leads to the conviction that it is in reality of the early date here assigned to it.

No apology therefore is needed for including mere fragments among the monuments we have to consider. So far as a Saxon character can be assigned with what the writer believes reasonable certainty to the monuments in question, they are all indicated on the map of Saxon Churches, Fig. 210.¹ This represents a personal examination of some four or five hundred examples signalized as showing some signs of

¹ An explanatory note is prefixed to the Alphabetical List followed by the Map, that occupies Chapter xiv.

Saxon origin. Other examples no doubt exist that would repay investigation. If this investigation however were carried out so completely as to cover every visible piece of Saxon masonry in all the British counties, the result would still not be a final one. There is a possibility that at any moment the stripping of plaster from a church wall of uncertain date may reveal unsuspected evidence of antiquity in the masonry below. It is a recognized fact that in a large number of cases the clearstory walls of aisled churches are of earlier date than the arcades which were cut through them in the Norman or later periods, and a good many of these are doubtless survivals from before the Conquest.

It will not have escaped the notice of observers that we find at times an absolutely certain indication of a Saxon doorway or window, as at Sherborne in Dorset, in a wall the masonry of which would not in itself have struck the eye as peculiar. In the absence of any such definite feature a wall that is really Saxon may pass unnoticed, and there may be very many such pieces of walling up and down the country. Hence the following treatment of the subject makes no claim to finality. The conclusions here reached are however based on a sufficiently large body of data for them to be offered with some confidence to the reader.

Questions may arise about (1) the number, (2) the geographical distribution of the monuments, as well as about (3) the criteria relied on to establish their Saxon character.

(1) The notices of the village church in general quoted in a previous volume conveyed the impression that Saxon England was, in proportion to its population, well supplied with churches, and some have gone so far as to say that the village church was almost as common a feature in rural England before the Norman Conquest as in the days of Elizabeth or George the Third.

There are sufficient incidental references to churches in

legal and other documents of the early mediaeval period to bear out this surmise. Numerous churches are mentioned in Saxon land charters and wills and in Domesday, though there is no attempt to give a list of them, to discriminate their different architectural forms, or to indicate which were of stone and which of wood. A Domesday editor has remarked that 'to refer to Domesday as in any way giving us correct information as to the number of churches is useless.'¹ Domesday notices of churches, as has been noted elsewhere,² are apparently fortuitous, and vary for no obviously assignable reason in the different counties. Whatever the *mention* of a church in Domesday may imply, the *silence* of the Commissioners is clearly no evidence against the existence of churches in the various localities given in the Survey; while on the other hand the actual numbers indicated in some of the counties and in special places are evidence enough that churches were plentiful. Three hundred and sixty-four are mentioned in Suffolk, two hundred and twenty-two in Lincolnshire, one hundred and eighty-six in Kent, one hundred and thirty-two in Hampshire. Twenty-four localities in Norfolk and sixteen in Kent had more than one place of worship apiece; Norwich city alone possessed fifty-four; Folkestone, Hoo, and Dartford, in Kent, respectively eight, six, and four. One manor in Hampshire, that of Chilcombe, which is said to embrace eight modern parishes, is credited in the Survey with nine churches, a number which would be fully up to modern requirements. Postling, in Kent, which till recent years, in its fold of the downs, looked as if it had not changed since long before Domesday, had at that time two small places of worship. A valuable article on the Domesday evidence about churches was communicated to *Archaeologia*, Vol. LXVI, by Mr William Page the editor of the *Victoria History of the Counties of England*. What he brings out seems to show that a church would only be mentioned if it had property of its own.

¹ *Domesday for Wiltshire*, Lond., 1865, p. lxi.

² Vol. I, p. 334 f.

When it was merely included in the general assessment and budget of a manor or of a religious body there was no reason for specially naming it.

One caution must be borne in mind in dealing with Domesday evidence. In cases where a church at a certain place is mentioned in the Survey and an edifice of early appearance is now to be seen on the spot, the tendency has sometimes been to leap to the conclusion that we have a Saxon building before us, though there may be nothing about it of pre-Conquest character. A period of some twenty years elapsed between the Conquest and the taking of the Survey, the date of which is subsequent to 1085-6, and Norman churches may have been built in the interval. This may have been the case for example at Albury and Abinger, in Surrey, where Domesday mentions churches, and we find buildings of Early Norman date now upon the sites. It is interesting to know what is the statistical relation between existing Anglo-Saxon churches and churches mentioned in Domesday ; to know, that is, how many churches that must have been standing when the Survey was taken have found a place in it. Taking the places enumerated on the map, Fig. 210, and leaving out of account the towns, the churches in which are difficult to identify by name, we obtain easily more than six score places that can be identified in the pages of the Survey but it is only at about sixty of these places that there is indication in Domesday of a church or even of a priest. In other words, it appears that only about half of the existing structures of pre-Conquest date are mentioned in Domesday, and some of the most conspicuous Saxon monuments, such as those in Northants, are ignored in the Survey. All the places in this county where Saxon churches now exist are mentioned, but the entry 'ibi ecclesia' is never added, though the church at Pattishall, a pre-Conquest example, is incidentally referred to in connection with the location of a plot of land.

The presence on a site of carved tombstones and crosses of

pre-Conquest type may be held to prove that there existed there in Saxon times a graveyard and in all probability a church. Such monuments however no more prove the Saxon date of an edifice in or near which they may now be found than does the mention of an ecclesia at some special village in Domesday involve the antiquity of its present parish church. They do not tell us whether the church by which they were originally located was of stone or of wood, though it may be noted that their number, which in some parts, counting fragments, is surprising, is at any rate evidence of considerable activity and of some skill on the part of the Saxon worker in stone. The ornamental forms and the figure sculpture on these stones are of some chronological importance in connection with the dating of the churches, and the comparisons thus suggested will have attention later on.

Saxon fonts tell us no more than Saxon tombstones, but Saxon sundials have this further value, that, being of stone and forming integral parts of the fabric, they imply a church of this material. A full list of existing Saxon sundials as well as of Saxon fonts is a desideratum, but would require special knowledge as well as untiring energy and patience on the part of an investigator. The examples of the former mentioned in the present volume are those at Corhampton, Hants; Stoke d'Abernon, Surrey; Bishopstone, Sussex; Daglingworth, Gloster; Stevington, Beds.; Escomb, Durham; Kirkdale, Yorks. Edston near this has one figured by Mr W. G. Collingwood in the *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, Vol. xix. There is one on the Saxo-Norman church of Wharram-le-Street, Yorks. Among fonts there is the one outstanding example at Deerhurst, figured at (p. 211), and after that royal presence there comes along a crowd of pretenders, some of which are Saxon though casually made up, as, e.g., Bingley, Yorks.; S Hayling, Hants; Little Wilne, Derbyshire, now much injured by a fire; and Wroxeter, Salop, cut out of a Roman shaft: others, as Little Billing, Northants; Potterne, Wilts, are attested

on the evidence of inscriptions which seem to be pre-Conquest, while a great number of the plain ' tub ' or ' bowl ' form, such as Culbone, Selworthy, Shepton Mallet, Somerset ; Selham, Walberton, Littlehampton, etc., Sussex ; Cuxwold, Lincs., are almost certainly Norman. The subject cannot be further pursued. See Francis Bond's *Fonts and Font Covers*, Lond., 1908, especially p. 125 f.

If documentary notices be as we have seen fortuitous, in that no valid conclusions can be drawn from them as to the total number of Saxon churches, the same may be said almost as confidently about the cases of actual survival. No general principle seems to be involved in the complete or partial preservation of certain examples and the total disappearance of others. We cannot say that such and such a percentage of Saxon churches has perished or been preserved. We have no ground even for saying that the churches which have entirely perished owed their destruction to the fact that they were of wood, while the stone ones were, as a rule, preserved. Local circumstances doubtless determined the treatment of the local shrine in XI as in all succeeding centuries of the mediaeval epoch. The timber churches that existed, no doubt in considerable numbers, at the Conquest were gradually replaced by stone structures, and this process which has been going on from the earliest Saxon times ¹ is not yet complete, for the wooden walls of one example are still standing ; while not only Saxon wooden churches but many Saxon stone churches were pulled down and rebuilt by the Normans. At Lastingham in Yorkshire for example there was a Saxon stone church,² but the fabric of the present edifice is Norman. This process of rebuilding stone churches in a later style has been in progress ever since, for Saxon churches, as at Framingham Pigot, near Norwich, have been replaced quite in our own time by modern structures. The cases of complete or partial survival are therefore of an accidental or casual kind, and give us no

¹ Vol. I, p. 167.

² Stone structural fragments in crypt.

assurance in estimating the actual former wealth in churches of Saxon England.

The different designations under which religious buildings are referred to in the Survey, in Anglo-Saxon Laws, and in charters and such documents, is a subject that cannot be entered on here. See Mr Page's article in *Archaeologia*, p. 67, and a paper by the Rev. O. J. Reichel referred to at the foot of that page. A distinction is made in the documents between an 'ecclesia' and an 'ecclesiola' or 'capella,' and there are in England two surviving examples of the pre-Conquest capella or ecclesiola existing side by side with Saxon parish churches, an arrangement frequently indicated in the documents.¹ One is at Heysham in Lancashire where the capella is of primitive form ;² the other is at Deerhurst in Gloucestershire and here the capella is a complete church with a nave and chancel (p. 307). The Saxon church at Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts, is referred to by William of Malmesbury as an ecclesiola, but though small in size it is somewhat elaborate and possessed nave, chancel, and lateral porches or quasi-transepts.

(2) The distribution of the examples as shown on the map of Saxon churches suggests some comment. They are in the first place confined to England. In the Lowlands of Scotland, though some districts of these received at an early date an Anglian population, the researches of Messrs MacGibbon and Ross³ did not reveal a single example with the special Saxon characteristics, though recent discoveries at Dunfermline have come to fill in the gap (p. 451). It is true that there exist buildings in Scotland which have dropped the distinctively Celtic motives and yet are not in their features characteristically Norman. The tower of Restennet Priory, Forfarshire, and St Regulus' Chapel, at St Andrews, may

¹ Vol. 1, p. 310 f.

² The plan of the early chapel at Heysham, with its surroundings, was given in Vol. 1, facing p. 312.

³ *The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1896-7.

be mentioned in this connection. These will be noticed on a later page (p. 441) in connection with a certain class of English buildings grouped under the heading 'the Saxo-Norman overlap,' which date after the Conquest but show the persistence of more primitive motives in Early Norman work of late XI and early XII. In Wales M. H. Bloxam claimed a pre-Conquest origin for the tower on Priestholm or Puffin Island, but this is clearly Norman, of no earlier date, though of simpler workmanship, than the tower of Penmon priory church on the neighbouring coast of Anglesea. Nothing Saxon seems to have been noted elsewhere in the Principality or in Cornwall. The church of Tintagel in Cornwall has certain features of Saxon character but these are not pronounced enough for it to be placed in our list of examples. The early ecclesiastical buildings in all these parts of Great Britain belong to the types generally termed Celtic, of which a brief notice will be given (p. 42 f.). There is one building in Ireland which has been claimed as akin to our own Saxon structures, and this is the W part of the priory church at Howth, on Dublin Bay. This structure however, while it lacks the usual Irish characteristics, does not exhibit any of the special features of Saxon buildings.

Saxon architecture proper is not only confined to England, but, as shown on the map, Fig. 210, it is more especially represented in the E and midland counties. Examples, if they exist at all, are very infrequent on the W side of the Pennine chain from Cumberland to the Mersey, in Stafford and Cheshire, and more to the S in the counties of Monmouth, Somerset, Dorset, and Devon. This may, of course, be explained in great part by the late and imperfect Teutonizing of the W parts of the country ; but it is not a little remarkable to find in Shropshire a kind of wedge of Saxon architecture driven, so to say, into the midst of the district in whose early ecclesiology Celtic traditions were predominant. The Saxon examples in this county invite the conjecture that a systematic

search in the W of England generally might bring to light a good many more. The SW counties probably contain more examples than have as yet been noticed. The question of the geographical distribution, not of the churches themselves simply as churches, but of the special types of churches and of their distinctive constructional or artistic features has been noticed in the Preface.

(3) With regard to the criteria for separating Saxon monuments from those of other architectural periods, all that is here in view is a preliminary survey of a necessarily superficial character addressed- to the non-architectural reader who desires some general knowledge of the subject before he goes on to study it in detail. When the broad features of the subject have been made clear by description and illustration the way will be prepared for an analysis of these from the points of view of origin, date, and continental affinity. General statements about Saxon architecture can only be made under reservation, for (1) there are marked differences of period so that what applies to one epoch may have little significance for another, and (2) all through the history of the style there is so much variety in forms and methods that exceptions can be found to almost every general rule that is laid down. In the later Saxon period we are near the time when Saxon architecture comes to an end and is replaced by Norman, so that the practical question at once presents itself: How are these two styles related and how can the monuments of the one be told from those of the other?

Can we 'spot' a country church as Saxon when we see it in passing from the seat of the whirling automobile? And can we if we stop to examine it confirm or dissipate our first impression by an analysis of its features and details? The answer in both cases is in the affirmative, though it will of course be understood that there are few criteria of absolute validity, but in many cases only indications that with greater or less cogency direct us towards a decision.

The first sight of a country church is generally of its tower and spire. A W tower that is of great height in proportion to its width and of conspicuous plainness will repay interrogation. If it be buttressed at the angles it is no use inquiring further, unless indeed the buttresses can be plainly seen to be later additions. If it rise gaunt and smooth, the outline only broken perhaps by a single horizontal string course above which it may slightly narrow, it has Saxon character and it is worth while devoting special attention to the belfry openings. If these be recessed the tower is almost certainly of Norman or later date, but if they possess the special characteristics presently to be described (p. 32), the building may be set down as in all probability of pre-Conquest origin, or at any rate of Saxon tradition.

Only less conspicuous than the tower of a church is the general shape of the body of it. When the side walls of the nave are of great proportionate height there is a suggestion of early date, but the appearance is often deceptive, for the height is sometimes merely due to the addition in late mediaeval times of a Perpendicular clearstory on the top of an earlier wall. On the other hand, when further investigation shows that the nave is of very great proportionate length as well as height, a strong presumption of Saxon origin is at once involved. It would be a mistake however to imagine that all Saxon naves are long, or that there is any one scheme of proportion that is exclusively the possession of the style. The analysis of the proportions of a number of Saxon naves the result of which is given in Fig. 2 proves the contrary.

It will be seen that some examples, notably in Kent, are comparatively wide, while others, especially some in the north like Monkwearmouth and Escomb, are long and narrow, while various intermediate degrees of proportion are also represented. The evidence of the extraordinary length of Jarrow old church is the statement in Hutchinson's *History of Durham*, II, 475 f., that it measured twenty-eight paces by




FIG. 2, Comparative chart showing the proportions of the naves (interior measurements) of twenty-four Saxon churches.

a width of only six. The walls were nearly thirty feet high.

The presumption of Saxon origin based on elongated proportions is strengthened if there be any indications that the original pitch of the roof was a steep one. If the original gable be not preserved the mark of it is sometimes seen on the wall of the tower, and a sharp-pointed gable is a Saxon peculiarity. If the character of the masonry be then examined some confirmation of the hypothesis of a Saxon origin may be found




FIG. 3, Plinths of Anglo-Saxon walls.
(Scale, c. $\frac{1}{2}$ in. to 1 ft.)

- A. Dunham Magna, Norfolk.
- B. Hainton Church tower, Lincolnshire.
- C. St Martin, Wareham, Dorset.
- D. Clee, Lincolnshire, plinth to tower arch.
- E. Stow, Lincolnshire, S transept.




FIG. 4, Quoin stones, SW angle of
S transept, Stow, Lincolnshire.

in the comparative rudeness and irregularity of the technique and the absence of any special treatment of the face, such as herring-bone work. Herring-bone work, which used to be considered a sign of Saxon origin, is now known to raise a presumption to the contrary. On the other hand there is no positive indication to be found in the mere character of the masonry in itself, the size and shape of stones, their petrological character, etc. ; in the tooling or other handling of the stones ; or in the thickness of the mortar joints and the composition and quality of this binding material. If we take

the different periods and the different districts of Saxon architecture as a whole, we find too many differences to make it safe to lay down any general rule. It is however justifiable to note that good quality in cement and plaster is characteristic of Saxon work especially in the earlier periods (p. 57). A considerable amount of assurance will be gained if the thickness of the wall turn out to be comparatively slight, say from 2 ft. to 2 ft. 6 in. Comparative thinness of wall is a good but by no means an absolute test of Saxon and Norman, and this measurement should always be taken. Norman walls nearly always run thicker than Saxon.

It may be asked whether the presence of all these indications in proportion, technique, thinness of walling, etc., be not enough to prove pre-Conquest origin? The question can hardly be answered in an absolute form. Every investigator must rely to a certain extent on his personal judgment the exact grounds of which cannot always be strictly formulated. The general aspect of a structure counts for something in any decision as to its date and style, and this can only tell on actual inspection. The local position and surroundings of a building must also be taken into account, and certain kinds of evidence are of more weight in one part of the country than in another. There is no question however that definite features and bits of characteristic detail are of greater value as criteria than the general aspect of a structure, and in the list of monuments which forms the basis of the map, Fig. 210, reliance has been placed almost exclusively on these definite features, and not on the more general considerations.

Taking these features and details therefore in order, we may note first that a Saxon wall may or may not have a plinth or base-moulding. There is a certain chronological interest here, for the plinth only occurs in the later Period C and is absent from the examples in Period A. This however does not at the moment concern us. In Period C it is a possible though by no means a general feature. There are different

forms of these plinths but no one of them is exclusively Saxon. Fig. 3 shows some examples. It will be noted that the profiles of the members are either square or chamfered and this rustic simplicity in forms is very characteristic of the Saxon style.




FIG. 5, Quoin of nave, St Mildred, Canterbury.




FIG. 6, Long and short quoin, Rockland All Saints, Norfolk.

N.B.—The scales in the two drawings do not correspond.

A more important and much more conspicuous feature about the wall is the treatment of its corners. Three methods are to be distinguished and there is a good deal here that is specifically Saxon and is proportionately valuable as a criterion,






FIG. 7, Pilaster strips on the nave wall of Woolbeding Church, Sussex.

The strips are about 7 in. in width.

(To face p. 25.)

Figs. 4, 5, and 6 give characteristic specimens, and in each case the work is of a kind to arrest the attention. So far as the mere arrangement of the quoin stones is concerned there is nothing abnormal about Fig. 4 for stones set alternately in a N and S and a W and E direction occur in Norman and later work as well as in Roman. What is Saxon in the quoining is the large size of the stones, the second from the top measuring 2 ft. in height, and this taste for the megalithic, an origin for which will be suggested later on (p. 46), is a characteristic that marks the Saxon builder. Fig. 5 makes this more distinct. Here stones, much bigger even than those at Stow, are not laid evenly along like the latter but are set up on end pillar-fashion and piled one on the other in irregular primitive agglomeration that has an undoubted impressiveness. The actual stones in work of this kind will often be Roman, as is the case here at St Mildred, Canterbury, where the lowest stone is 4 ft. in height by 2 ft. 8 in. in width and 1 ft. 5 in. in thickness. There is a similar quoin at the W end of this same S wall of the nave. The expression 'big stone quoins' is used in this volume for work of this kind, which begins in VII, see Fig. 48, and occurs sporadically through the later Saxon periods.

Fig. 6 introduces the reader to what is to most people the Saxon peculiarity par excellence, the so-called long and short work. This special treatment of the quoins of buildings has its own historical and chronological interest which will presently be discussed (p. 55), but it is just shown here in a characteristic example from Rockland All Saints, Norfolk. The upright pillar-like stones called 'long' are contrasted with flat or 'short' stones that bond into the wall, and the whole effect is original and striking. So specially Saxon is it that it is almost though not altogether a determining feature on which we can safely base a decision. It belongs to Period C and of course is not universally employed even here.

An equally significant feature and one that can be caught

by a passing glance is the so-called pilaster strip. This bears some superficial resemblance to a buttress but it is not a buttress and the two must be kept distinct. This distinction involves historical considerations which will be dealt with subsequently (p. 238 f.). Here it needs only to be noticed that the pilaster strip is a narrow vertical band of stonework averaging about 6 in. in width disposed at intervals, often in rather casual fashion, along the walls of a building but not




FIG. 8, Saxon doorway at Diddlebury Church, Salop. From a sketch by J. T. Irvine.

clasping its corners. Fig. 7 shows a characteristic example from a Sussex church. The strip is of very slight projection and obviously meant rather to decorate than to strengthen the fabric. It is one of the very surest of Saxon criteria and is even superior in this respect to l. and s. work in quoins.

A test, on which however too much reliance must not be placed, is to be found in the conspicuous features of door and window openings. Three points are to be noticed about these (1) proportions, (2) forms of door and window heads, (3) treatment of the jambs. The proper discussion of these involves considerations of provenance and of history that cannot be entered on here, and it will be enough to give a simple conspectus of the features with the proviso that among all the various forms and details involved there is hardly one on which implicit trust can be placed as a Saxon criterion.

A. Doorways. The position of these is worth noting. It is characteristically Saxon, though of course not a universal

arrangement, to place these N and S, often just opposite each other, at the W end of the nave. One of them, generally that to N, is now very commonly blocked. Fig. 8 shows a blocked Saxon N doorway that is characteristic. In these doorways, as in the cognate tower and chancel arches that are




FIG. 9, Tower arch, Market Overton, Rutland. Saxon technique.




FIG. 10, Chancel arch at Stainton-by-Tickhill, Yorks. Norman technique.

conspicuous features in these early churches, there is considerable variety in (1) proportions, and as a rule, just as is the case with the shape of the building generally and of its parts, tall and narrow forms are Saxon rather than Norman. (2) The doorways may be headed with a flat lintel which we find both early and late, or, as is far more common, may be arched.

Anglo-Saxon arch construction involves points of technical interest (p. 65), but it may be noted here that if the arch-stones or voussoirs run through the whole thickness of a thin wall there is a strong probability that the work is pre-Conquest,




FIG. 11, Tower arch, Brigstock, Northants, showing pilaster strips carried round the arch. The pilaster strips on each side start from projecting corbels. From a drawing by J. T. Irvine.

but if in a thicker wall there be squared stones on the two faces with rubble filling in the middle, the probability is very greatly decreased.¹ This difference, which is one of no little significance, is illustrated by the arches placed together for contrast in Figs. 9 and 10. An arch built with through-stones as at

¹ The observer should be warned that there are cases in which genuine through-stones have had sham mortar joints camouflaged across them. This seems to have been done at Stanton-by-Bridge, Derbyshire.

Market Overton is certainly either Saxon or Roman ; one of the other kind, though much more probably Norman, may yet be of Saxon origin.

Observation should also be made of the method of cutting the voussoirs of the archivolt, of the form of the imposts, and of the enrichment, if any exist, on one or both of the faces of the arch. The signs of ignorance or want of skill in shaping and fitting the wedge-shaped voussoirs, and a clumsy or a fantastic character in the imposts are Saxon symptoms ; but the most significant feature, where it occurs, is the use for the enrichment of the arch of pilaster strips like those on external walls just noticed. In vertical form these often appear in projection on the jambs and flank an arch opening, and the same strip is carried continuously as decoration round the extrados of the arch. There is a good example in Fig. 11 where the voussoirs are particularly well cut. To save space the compendious term 'strip-work round openings' will be used for this throughout the volume. The enrichment of an arched opening by the process of recessing is known in Saxon architecture but is not in common use, and as it is specially characteristic of Norman building it can be used with due reserve as presumptive evidence of post-Conquest origin, but may at the same time be Saxon, and the same applies with equal force to the addition to the composition of angle shafts and angle or soffit rolls. In general the development of mouldings and architectural enrichment takes us rather out of the Saxon domain, and this applies specially when these decorative details are of a normal and grammatical kind. Anything bizarre or outré in ornament though it may be pretty elaborate is suspiciously Saxon in character, though Early Norman carvers are also capable of some strange performances. It is worth making an entry in the notebook if an arch be set back on its jambs, so that the aperture at its springing is wider than the space between the jambs, and also if the arch itself be horseshoe shaped in its outline, phenomena

which occur in work on the border line between Saxon and Norman, and also in work definitely Saxon (Limpley Stoke, Wilts) and definitely Norman (Winchester, N transept).

Another form of heading is the so-called 'straight sided arch' in the form of a circumflex accent, sometimes termed 'triangular heading.' This is generally confined to door openings of a smaller or subsidiary kind, see Fig. 12, and is also in use for windows. It is Saxon but not exclusively

Saxon for it occurs in Early Norman work as in the ruined monastic buildings at Jarrow-on-Tyne.




FIG. 12, Opening in tower at Brigstock, Northants. From an Irvine drawing.

As a rule Saxon doorways are cut straight through the thickness of the wall without any rebate for a door, which in this case was hung on staples projecting from the face of the jamb so as to close across the opening. The doorway shown in Fig. 8, which has plain imposts and strip-work round the opening, shows still on the inner face of the wall remains of the iron staples on which the door was

hung. On the other hand in the earlier Period A rebated doorways are in evidence, and we find them at Monkwearmouth (p. 124), Corbridge (p. 142), Escomb (p. 141), and Reculver (p. 96) where the original and very early doorway of about 680 A.D. into the space before the apse has the jambs in the interior cut into a shallow rebate 2 in. in depth by a length along the wall of 6 in. In certain quite late examples of Period C rebates for doors have been cut in modern times, as at Billingham, Durham (tower doorway into nave), and Wootton Wawen, Warwickshire (W arch from tower into nave). The rebate at Heysham (p. 190) may not be original.

(3) Treatment of the jambs. The vertical pilasters on the face of these have been noticed. In the masonry of these

jambes there is a Saxon method for the setting of the stones, seen in Fig. 11, which because of its historical significance must be treated elsewhere (p. 53); as in the case of the voussoirs it depends on the use of through-stones, or stones equal in length to the thickness of a wall. The inclination of jambes which narrows the opening in its upper part is a peculiarity of stone construction (p. 46) of wide use both for doorways and for windows, Fig. 13, and it used to be reckoned a Saxon symptom. It is however often employed in this country in Norman work and is not a safe criterion.

In the matter of imposts, which are in general but not universal use (p. 189), the most common Saxon form at all periods is the plain chamfer, which is however also a Roman, Fig. 25, and a Norman form, Fig. 10. The chamfer may be hollowed, and this is quite a Saxon detail, Fig. 108 (p. 264), but the quirked chamfer, where there is a sharp nick just at the angle where the vertical and sloping

faces meet, can never be pronounced with certainty the work of a Saxon chisel. It occurs often enough in buildings which are on the border line between Saxon and Norman, but a Norman mason is probably always responsible for it. The use of it implies a feeling for what is sharp and distinct which is rather more in place in Norman work than in Saxon where vaguely determined forms are more characteristic. Though this seems true of the particular detail called the 'quirked chamfer' it does not follow that a sharp nick of the kind is excluded from the repertory of Saxon forms. It occurs for example on the moulded impost of the chancel arch at Deerhurst Chapel which is genuinely Saxon though dating within ten years of the Conquest, Fig. 191, E. A plain square




FIG. 13, Window with sloping jambes, at Brigstock, Northants. From an Irvine drawing.

impost of massive proportions is quite Saxon and the soffit may have a slope as in Fig. 9 and also in the typically Saxon chancel arch at Wittering, Northants, Fig. 186. The profiles of some enriched imposts of the later period are noticed further on (p. 405).

There is one detail observable from time to time in Saxon work of all periods that should here have a word. This is what may be called the 'step pattern,' and it occurs in imposts, capitals, bases, and elsewhere. It is largely used in Anglo-Saxon decorative work of the pagan period, illustrated in Vols. III and IV of this work, and also in our Early Christian MS. ornamentation. Imposts formed of two or three Roman tiles, each one projecting a little beyond the one below, occur in the earliest Anglo-Saxon buildings, and also, in flat stones as well as tiles, at a quite late period as at Wing, Bucks (p. 280). The motive occurs so often and is so characteristic that it necessitates special treatment, and for this a suitable place will be found in Chapter x.

B. Window openings. These are single, double, and multiplex; there is more variety about them than about doorways, and they differ from the latter in that as a rule the apertures are not cut straight through the wall and the plan of the jambs exhibits significant variations. At the same time there do exist smaller single openings generally in the walls of towers that sometimes have the character of peep holes and that are plain square cuts. These are not however of much importance. On the other hand perhaps the most important form of window opening in Saxon buildings is also pierced straight through, but is a double opening of considerable aperture, and will occupy our attention in coming chapters. Here only a rapid conspectus is needed to secure a general idea of this characteristic and interesting feature.

The kind of opening in question is generally in belfries where its wide aperture avails for the transmission of sound, but occurs occasionally in the walls of churches, as at Worth,

Sussex, Fig. 14, Wing, Bucks, Fig. 108, and Brixworth, Northants, Fig. 52. The last is triple while the belfry openings in Earls Barton tower in the same county are fivefold, Fig. 124. All the rest are double. These openings are all subdivided and the way in which the partition is managed is





FIG. 14, Window in N wall of nave, Worth, Sussex, with plan.

the point to note. Each half of the aperture is covered by a small round arch and between these a bit of the wall would be left suspended in the air were it not held beneath by a flat stone slab of sufficient area, that is itself sustained by a single prop in the form of a stone shaft that stands under the centre of it. The form of the shaft and of the cap which sometimes

surmounts it are often worthy of remark. The former is sometimes that of a plain cylindrical column, sometimes it is octagonal, or square with rounded corners. It takes however occasionally the peculiar form of a baluster with a series of projections and hollows that often appear to be formed on the




FIG. 15, Subdivided opening with baluster shaft in the tower of Barton-on-Humber, Lincolnshire. The splaying downwards of the sill is a convenient modification.

lathe. The caps are either cubical or ionic of a debased form. Both caps and shafts will be studied on subsequent pages (pp. 252 f., 257 f.). It is the combination of the unrecessed openings, the flat slab called a through-stone, and the shaft called from its position a mid-wall shaft, that is the distinguishing mark which gives the whole structure a Saxon stamp. Such windows in the side wall of a nave and in the upper story of a tower are shown in Figs. 14 and 15.

Coming now to the single apertures for light, (1) their proportions vary from the substantial width of those at Brix-

worth (p. 108) and St Peter-on-the-Wall, Essex (p. 103), to very tall and narrow slits. The circular form is found fairly often, as at Avebury, Wilts (p. 37), Bosham, Sussex (p. 434); and small round apertures are often pierced through the walls of belfries to aid the transmission of sound. On the origin and early history of circular windows Comm. Rivoira has some interesting remarks.¹ Not found in Period A but possible in B, they appear in C and continue to the latest Saxon epoch, where we also find the tall and narrow window in vogue.

¹ *Lombardic Architecture*, Eng. Trans., Lond., 1910, II, 223.

(2) The heads of windows, like those of the Saxon doorways, are flat or round or triangular, and are in the second case often cut out of a single stone, Fig. 65, etc., after a fashion that is Roman (heads of gates in the stations on the Roman Wall), Norman (Bengeo, Herts, E window in apse, etc., etc.), and even Early English (later part of Reculver Church, Kent).

(3) It is in the treatment of the jambs that the real interest of Saxon windows resides. These are rarely parallel in plan but are set at angles to each other, the plan in most cases both early and late showing a splay by which the inner opening becomes much, and even many times, wider than that on the external face. In the later Saxon work of Period C we find in common use the characteristic Saxon window known as 'double splayed,' where the actual aperture for light is at or about the middle of the thickness of the wall and there is a splay both outwards and inwards. These double splayed windows may be either circular or of the upright r. h. shape, and the actual opening for light is sometimes cut in a slab of stone or plank of wood built into the wall at the centre of its thickness. The aperture in the slab may take a decorative shape, as for instance that of a keyhole, a form no doubt derived from arches set back on jambs (p. 29) and found in double splayed windows in the tower of Langford Church, Oxfordshire, and in the aperture of the single, or internally, splayed window in the tower of Clee, Lincolnshire, shown in Fig. 188. The aperture may be cut on a cruciform scheme for in the tower at Earls Barton, Northants, there are double splayed lights with mid-wall slabs pierced with circular openings in the slab, while in others these are cruciform. At E Lexham in Norfolk, there is a mid-wall slab in a pre-Conquest opening in the tower that is also cruciform, only here the cross is stone and the background is aperture. Some openings in the belfry stage of the tower at Billingham, Durham, have apertures cut into the shape of an eight-pointed star. Sometimes the piercing takes the form of a more elaborate pattern, and the best

instances of this are in the tower openings of Barnack Church, Northants, where there is tracery the form of which must be noticed in another connection in the sequel (p. 274).

Pierced wooden mid-wall slabs are to be seen in a more or less decayed condition in double splayed openings at Barton-on-Humber, Lincs. ; Birstall, Leicestershire ; Stevington, Beds.

The plans of a few characteristic window openings with single and double splay are given in Fig. 16. In regard to the latter it is to be noted that the light aperture is not always




FIG. 16, Comparative plans of window openings.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Clearstory at Brixworth. | 7. Brixworth, E wall. |
| 2. St Martin, Wareham. | 8. Boarhunt, Hants. |
| 3. Splayed Roman at Cilurnum on the North Tyne. | 9. Barton-on-Humber, W adjunct. |
| 4. W Wall of Church, Monkwearmouth. | 10. Tower light, Howe, Norfolk. |
| 5. Killiney Church, Ireland. | 11 and 12. Ledbury, Herefordshire, and Overbury, Worcestershire (not drawn to scale), of Norman date. |
| 6. Chancel at West Hampnett, Sussex. | |

in the actual middle of the thickness of the wall but sometimes nearer the outer face. This at first would suggest lateness of date, as if the double splay were gradually merging into the more widely used single splay, and some Sussex churches that are on the border line between Saxon and Norman show this peculiarity. It occurs however at Barton-on-Humber, Fig. 16, no. 9, and this church, though of Period C, is not one of the later ones. The arrangement of the double splay at Avebury, Wilts, is remarkable enough to merit illustration, see Fig. 17,¹

¹ *Wiltshire Magazine*, xxi, 188 f. Thanks are due to the Wiltshire Society for leave to reproduce in Fig. 17 part of one of the Plates in the article.

as it illustrates also the cutting of a central aperture in a stone slab and is a curious example of the abnormal way in which Saxon builders sometimes went to work.

Fig. 17 exhibits a section of the upper part of the Saxon nave wall where the opening comes, and below is shown a stone slab pierced with the aperture that is built into the wall on its outer face and is seen in the section given above. The aperture is double splayed, but the inner splay is continued through the masonry of the wall to its inner face by a very curious device that, one would say, only a Saxon builder would have thought of. Round the edge of the inner splay there are drilled a number of small holes in a direction sloping inwards and in these were set sticks that radiated outwards continuing the line of the splay cut in the stone. Thinner split sticks were interwoven with them so as to make a kind of funnel of wattle-work. The stone was then set in the wall as shown above and the wattle-work was embedded in plaster that took the funnel-like form which it gave, the plaster being of course backed with the rubble walling.

These curiously wrought round windows at Avebury are high up in the wall, on a line of about 24 ft. from the original floor, while lower down, on a line similarly reckoned of about 11 ft., there were internally splayed r. h. lights with apertures 4 ft. high, and with the interesting feature of rebates for shutters that would close flush with the exterior face of the wall. Such rebates occur elsewhere but are quite uncommon.





FIG. 17, Double splayed circular light at Avebury, Wilts.

CHAPTER III

THE SOURCES OF EARLY ANGLO-SAXON ARCHITECTURE

OUR SAXON forefathers brought with them no traditions of stone building, and while sods or wattle and daub may have sufficed in many cases for their cottages, any building of a more ambitious kind would be of timber, and the material would certainly be used on the block system, not as framework and filling but as forming a homogeneous structure such as we find to this day wherever, as in Canada, Switzerland, or Sweden, timber is abundant.

There may be introduced here a notice of the one specimen of Anglo-Saxon block technique that has come down to us, as well as a brief reference to a new discovery bearing on the simplest forms of civic building. With regard to the last reference may be made to the recent exhumation by Mr Thurlow Leeds, of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, of a group of apparently Anglo-Saxon dwellings of a very primitive kind not far from Abingdon in Berkshire. The dwellings are on a deposit of gravel now being worked, and, while nothing in the meantime can be said about the technique of their walls or roofing, which must have been of the slightest, it is certain that the latter was supported by wooden posts fixed in the gravel, for the holes sunk for these and later on filled up with earth are plainly to be seen. Within the little dwellings there have come to light a number of small objects of Roman and of Anglo-Saxon character, but the summer of 1923 was signalized by the meteoric appearance in one of the little dwellings of a most notable specimen of Teutonic jewellery of a rare kind and of great historical significance. Mr Leeds's account

of his discoveries has just been published in *Archaeologia*, Vol. LXXIII.

A word may also be said about some discoveries of a very promising kind made recently by the Ancient Monuments Department of H.M. Office of Works under the direction of Mr C. R. Peers upon the hill of Whitby. There in the vicinity of the well known Abbey ruins and to the north of them distinct traces have come to light of the early Saxon monastic settlement associated with the names of Hild and of Cædmon. Decorated objects of great interest have been found, with what is more germane to the present purpose traces of early buildings of a simple kind. The results have not yet been published, and they are of special importance in that they suggest the possibility of similar discoveries on other early Saxon monastic sites such as Old Melrose or Coldingham.

In the matter of solid timber construction the example above referred to comes from the later Saxon epoch but may be taken as typical for the whole period. It is the nave of the existing church at Greenstead in Essex, and there is good reason to date it about the year 1015.¹

The church, which is a mile or so from Chipping Ongar just beyond the bounds of Epping forest, consists now in a modern chancel of normal type, a nave measuring internally 26 ft. by 17 ft. and a western tower. The last is coated with wooden planks and is comparatively modern, the nave is the Saxon fabric and the walls of it are composed of upright balks of timber, made of trunks of oak trees split down the middle, stripped of their bark, and smoothed with the adze on their

¹ In a document associated with St Edmundsbury, that is given in Dugdale's *Monasticon*, III, 139, it is stated that in the year 1013 the body of St Edmund was conveyed from London to Suffolk and rested for a night near Aungre (Ongar) where a chapel was constructed of timber for its reception. *Apud Aungre hospitabatur ubi in ejus memoria lignea capella permanet usque hodie.* There can be little question that this is the very structure that has come down to us. See also Vol. I, 26, 37.

flat faces. They are placed closely side by side with the flat faces inwards and the half rounds showing on the exterior. The joints between them are covered internally with modern strips about 2 in. wide. The general aspect of these wooden walls may be judged from the view of the NW corner given in Fig. 18. What is seen now is a reconstruction. Originally the split trunks were let into a sill of oak at the bottom and




FIG. 18, NW corner of timber church at Greenstead, Essex.

fastened at the top with wooden pins to a horizontal plate, but the lower parts of the fabric had become rotten through the ground damp, and in the year 1848 it was taken to pieces and the uprights laid out on the ground for examination. The lower portions of them were then cut off and they were re-mounted as they stand at present on an oaken sill upon a low wall of brick.

The technique here is the simplest possible. The walls are simply strong palisades. The sill and the plate are mere adjuncts for fixing purposes and are essentially posterior, not

prior, to the uprights that represent the main structure. There is no sign of that skeleton which in framed work is essentially prior to the filling and of heavier section. It is necessary to insist on this as Professor Dietrichson in a work presently to be noticed is inclined to regard the corner pieces, the sills, and the horizontal lintels as answering to the framing of the more scientifically constructed Norwegian churches. As a fact there are at Greenstead no corner pieces, but the corner is formed of a bole just like the others the only difference being that a quarter is taken out of its section instead of its being split




FIG. 19. Plan of NW corner at Greenstead. Scale, $\frac{1}{20}$ of nature.

in half ; see Fig. 19, which shows the ground plan of the NW corner.

The style and technique of Greenstead we must assume to have been general in the numberless wooden churches erected at all the periods of Anglo-Saxon church history and in all parts of the country, from the timber shanties of Paulinus at York¹ and Aidan on the Farne Island² to the church of X that Dunstan moved round with his shoulder to get it properly oriented. It would be a mistake to bring into too close a connection with these buildings the well known timber churches of Norway, on which Professor Dietrichson published an instructive monograph.³ The nature of these highly interesting structures and the bearing of them on our

¹ Bede, *Hist. Eccl.*, II, 14.

² *ibid.*, III, 17.

³ *De Norske Stavkirker*, Christiania, 1892.

native architectural questions will be discussed on a subsequent page (p. 197).

The traditions of stone building which the Teutonic invaders could not have brought with them they would find in the land of their adoption flowing from two sources Celtic and Roman. Though in Celtic lands the so-called 'Mos Scottorum' of building with wood may have as a rule prevailed, yet in Ireland and to a more limited extent in Scotland, Wales, and Cornwall we can see from existing remains that there was an old stone-building tradition highly developed in some parts in pagan times that was maintained in occasional use for Christian purposes by the Celtic Church. The technique was that of the so-called 'dry stone' masonry in which no cement or plaster is employed, and the forms were of the simplest though the construction was cunning and careful. We are only of course concerned with Christian structures but we find among these some of the most interesting of ecclesiastical buildings. Few Christian monuments can surpass in romantic charm the little dry stone oratory shown in Fig. 20. It stands in an outlying corner of the enclosure formed by a magnificent dry stone terrace wall that upholds the early monastic settlement on the rock of Skellig Michael off the coast of Kerry, Ireland. There are views of the settlement on p. 152 of Vol. 1 and a plan on p. 198, where the building in question is marked 'oratory no. 2.' The situation on the very edge of the steep; the construction in which walls and roof are as one, the stone slabs overlapping as the structure rises till they come together at the apex; the minute size, for the interior is only 8 ft. long; the simplicity, for there is just a door at one end and a window at the other or E end underneath which was a stone altar—all combine to make the tiny cell live more clearly in the memory of the few who see it than is the case with many a storied shrine. The ground plan is given as B on Fig. 21, where it is shown in conjunction with some other simple, and presumably early, types of





FIG. 20, Small square Oratory of dry stonework on Skellig Michael, off Kerry, Ireland.

(To face p. 42.)



plan to be referred to in the sequel (p. 188). We may take it as beginning, not in point of time but in that of form, the whole magnificent after development of Christian architecture.

The next stage brings a building still single and still constructed without mortar but with vertical walls quite distinct from the roof. One may be seen in Scotland on the very early site on Eilean Naomh, the Isle of the Saints, one of the Garvelloch Islands off Argyllshire and another near Gallow-




FIG. 21, Plans of single-celled oratories.

head in Lewis,¹ and this shows that stone architecture was advancing independently of new materials and technique. These however have been introduced by the time of the next advance which subdivides the building by the addition of a separate altar house. This might be added on to the original interior, or the original cell might become the altar house the addition being built on to form a nave to W of it. This last seems the case with the small Irish oratory on Friar's Island, near Killaloe on the Shannon, the plan of which is given in

¹ MacGibbon and Ross, *The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland*, Edin., 1896, 1, 66 f.

Fig. 22. We have here established the simple nave and chancel form of church that is normal in Ireland in the early




FIG. 22, Early Irish oratory, with altar house, Friar's Island, Killaloe.

mediaeval period and of which two specimens are seen in Fig. 23. The uppermost is the plan of Killiney old church between Dublin and Kingstown, the lower view of 'Trinity'

church, Glendalough. The wide chancel arch and the absence of imposts, with the construction of the jambs, should be noted and will be referred to again. This is also the most common, indeed so far as our evidence goes the normal form of the Anglo-Saxon church, and the question at once arises whether the latter is derived from the Irish examples.

It is unfortunate that, as Mr Arthur Champneys depllores,¹ these early Irish nave and chancel churches cannot be dated, and we cannot be certain that any existing examples are really of an earlier date than similar buildings erected by the newly converted Saxons. We have however the following facts to guide our conjectures. These double chambered churches are built not in the old dry stone technique but of roughly squared stones set in mortar. Such wrought stonework with the use of cement was not indigenous in Ireland but came in from Romanized Britain or Gaul, and the question is at how early a date this may have taken place. Now we know that as early as the beginning of V Ninian had built at Whiterne in Galloway, on Gallic or derived classical lines, a stone church called Candida Casa from the whitewashed plaster of its exterior. We know too that, as Mr Plummer's *Lives of Irish Saints*² make abundantly clear, Whiterne in V and VI, like Menevia, or St Davids, in South Wales, was much

¹ *Irish Ecclesiastical Architecture*, Lond., 1910, 30 f.

² *Vitae Sanctorum Hibernorum*, Oxford, 1910.

frequented by Irish churchmen as a place of study (Vol. v, p. 50, note) and it is probable that among a people with stone-build-




FIG. 23, Plan of Killiney Old Church near Dublin.

Plan and interior view of 'Trinity' Church, Glendalough.

ing traditions this advanced method of building would soon find imitators though perhaps on a humble scale, so that as

Mr Champneys remarks, 'it is not impossible that there should have been a good number of churches built with stone and mortar at a very early date in Ireland.'¹ These may have been the source of an influence exercised, under conditions previously noticed (Vol. I, 149 f.) on the newly converted Teutonic immigrants.

Such influence may be held to explain, at any rate in part, the square ends of our Saxon altar houses, and the influence would not only concern planning, but may have originated a technical peculiarity strongly marked in a good deal of Anglo-Saxon work. It is noticed of the earliest mortar-built churches in Ireland that 'there is a distinct preference apparent in many buildings for using very large stones, at all events in a part of the wall,'² and we may find here the source of what has been called the 'megalithic feeling' in Anglo-Saxon architecture, expressing itself chiefly in the quoins of buildings (p. 25). This would hardly come from the Roman side, for, though Roman constructors built massively with stones whose sheer weight lent stability to a fabric, the facing of their walls was as a rule homogeneous up to the corners, and the size of the stones, whatever it was, was retained throughout. If any foreign source for the Anglo-Saxon peculiarity be sought for it would be Ireland. Ireland is noted for the development of the megalithic in the pre-historic rude stone monument, and among a race in some things intensely conservative we can understand the tradition continued through the Bronze Age where it produces Newgrange, and lending character to the later pagan and Early Christian monuments. To Irish tradition may also be ascribed a peculiarity in the form of the openings in Saxon stone buildings both early and late, the slope inward of the jambs through which the aperture at the top of the window or doorway is narrower than at the base (p. 31). This is a natural form in early stone architecture, and it occurs in the megalithic structures of the Bronze Age

¹ *Irish Eccl. Arch.*, p. 35.

² *ibid.*, p. 29.

in Greece, but not, apparently, in Egypt. The advantage of it is that it reduces the space that has to be spanned by a stone lintel, and it is a very common device in the pagan and Early Christian stone buildings of Ireland. It has not been noticed in Normandy but it does occur in what seems to be Early Norman rather than Late Saxon work in our own country as at Wharram-le-Street, Yorks.

It must be noted at the same time that for certain other marked Anglo-Saxon peculiarities that are not of Roman origin we do *not* find Celtic prototypes. Among these are long and narrow proportions of church plans and great comparative height of side walls. The tradition of stone roofing by encorbellment, see Fig. 20, inherited by Early Christian builders in Ireland from their pagan forefathers might have been expected to result in a tendency to contract internal breadth. This was not however the case, for as a fact both the single-celled interiors and the naves of the more advanced structures are by no means of specially narrow proportions. It is just possible that the original derivation from the circular form may have been at work in keeping the two dimensions of the rectangle near each other. The striking Celtic methods of stone roofing by the pseudo-vault constructed by encorbellment did not affect the Saxon builder who shows no knowledge of this technique, though the sharpness of gable that in Ireland results from this method may conceivably be held to account in some measure for the acute angles at the apices of Saxon roofs, the original lines of which are sometimes preserved on the eastern wall of a W tower when the actual gable has in later times been lowered. The Irish example shown in Fig. 24 will make this clear. Here the side walls are low but the stone roof in encorbellment brings with it an acutely pointed gable. For a Saxon example see Fig. 164.

It is worth noting that there is one small and apparently early building in England which combines distinctively Irish with Saxon features, and is thought by some to be Celtic.

This is the chapel of St Patrick at Heysham on Morecambe Bay and it will be noticed later on (p. 187 f.).

The Celtic building forms here noticed would not come directly before the immigrant Teutons, because the native inhabitants of Romanized Britain had in the main adopted classical fashions, so that what the Anglo-Saxons found among them would be for the most part Roman. The purely Celtic




FIG. 24, Oratory on St Macdara's Island, off Connemara, Ireland.

influences which an endeavour has just been made to trace came indirectly through the agency of the Irish missionaries who Christianized so large a part of the country (Vol. I, 157 f.). Roman models on the other hand met the invaders in face as soon as their keels ascended the Tyne or Southampton Water or were brought to land at Richborough or Ipswich, and from these models Saxon architecture derived some of its most characteristic features.

It may be assumed that Romans and Romanized Britons employed practically all the forms, materials, and processes

in use over the empire at large. Work in sun-dried brick 'opus lateritium' we need not look for, but we find represented among the Roman remains in England (1) 'opus quadratum' or construction with large squared stones, the 'grand appareil' of the French ; (2) the massif of rubble concrete, or 'structura caementicia' faced with small parallelepiped stones—'petit appareil'—with or without bonding




FIG. 25, Jamb of Roman gateway at Chesters, on the North Tyne.

courses of brick ; (3) 'opus testaceum' where the fabric or skin of a structure is in burnt brick ; (4) the plain wall, often quite thin, of irregular stonework with no special facing or technique ; and finally (5) the light partition of woodwork and plaster. The following brief notes contain some facts of which we shall need to take account.

As an example of Roman 'opus quadratum' the jamb of a Roman gateway still standing at the station of Cilurnum (Chesters) on the Northumbrian Wall may be taken as typical

(Fig. 25). Some noble specimens of massive Roman stonework have recently come to light at Corstopitum (Corbridge) on the Tyne.

In some of our Roman structures very large stones may be found employed as footing, or to form the upright jambs and sills or lintels of doorways, and these vertical and horizontal pieces are occasionally mortised into each other after




FIG. 26, Roman doorway at Chesters on the North Tyne, showing the monolithic jambs mortised into the sill and lintel.

the fashion shown in Fig. 26, where the slabs lining the doorway measure more than 6 ft. in height by 2 ft. 6 in. in width, and have a ridge cut out along their top to fit into a corresponding groove in the lintel, which has now disappeared. Instances of the Saxon use of these pieces of abnormal size will meet us as we proceed, and the 'megalthic' in Saxon work may so far be suggested by Roman as well as Celtic models.

One peculiarity of the large squared stones used in this opus quadratum is their tooling. They are often scored by the pick with diagonal indentations that sometimes cross each

other so as to form diamonds, or with more deeply marked semicircular grooves. See Fig. 27. It is advisable to take note of this Roman treatment of the surfaces of stones, as it enables Roman stones to be recognized when re-used, as is so often the case, in Saxon walling. The tooling on such re-used stones has sometimes been signalized as 'Saxon.'

The Roman method of construction in rubble concrete is




FIG. 27, Tooling on Roman stones in the Northumberland Wall.

represented in fair abundance in Britain in walls both of a civil and a military character. The regular small squared stones, with which these are commonly faced, give them a very distinctive character. Lines of brickwork composed of two or three flat tiles superimposed occur very commonly at intervals of a few feet. The mortar in which the small stones or bricks are set is often compounded with coarsely pulverized tiles.

Roman brickwork is less common in the north of Britain

than in the south, but it is not unknown in the higher latitudes. There is evidence of its use on more than one site in Scotland, and not long ago it was found as far north as the Roman station at Inchtuthil in Perthshire, where has come to light a Roman bath. The North however has always been a stone country, and in all the structures connected with the Roman Wall




FIG. 28, Roman archway at Pola in Istria.

between the Tyne and Solway this is the material par excellence. We find here walling of large squared stones and of smaller material very carefully cut and set, but the stations on the Tyne also furnish partition walls of rubble stonework not specially faced, that resemble walls found in Roman villas all over the country. These walls differ from the regularly faced ones by their thinness and slightness of technique. They are commonly from 1 ft. to 2 ft. thick, whereas the faced

walls, as must necessarily follow from their technique, are far stouter.

In Roman wall construction in squared stonework, as a general rule no special technique is observable at the quoins, which are usually carefully made up in the same 'appareil' as the walling. The peculiar Anglo-Saxon quoining which goes by the popular name of 'long and short work' is certainly not in evidence in Roman buildings in this country or elsewhere. It is however of indirect Roman derivation, and comes in through the medium of a certain treatment of the jambs of openings, which is Roman though not in common use and was taken over and employed as a favourite form of treatment by Anglo-Saxon builders in all the periods of their operations. The method of jamb construction in question is well illustrated by a ruined Roman doorway at Pola in Istria shown Fig. 28. The work would be called 'long and short' by most writers on Anglo-Saxon architecture but a more accurate appellation would be 'upright and flat.' The jambs are formed here of stone slabs laid flat and set up on end alternately on a system employed also in Byzantine work of about V in the western door of the Parthenon at Athens, Fig. 29, where however, owing to the fact that the present surface of the jambs is only a 'revêtement' of the original Greek isodomic wall, the flat pieces do not bite into the masonry. No Roman doorway treated in this fashion seems to be visible in Britain in situ, but there is practically no doubt at all that the magnificent chancel arch at Escomb near Bishop Auckland in County Durham is such a Roman arch transported and re-used for Christian purposes. The scheme and dimensions of this are given in Fig. 30, see also Fig. 63.




FIG. 29, Byzantine doorway in Parthenon, Athens.

The pages which follow contain numerous references to a similar treatment of the jambs of openings observable, as has just been said, in Anglo-Saxon churches of all periods, and as




Fig. 30, Chancel arch at Escomb, Durham.

we shall see (p. 369) surviving into Norman times. For the sake of convenience the reader is asked to accept the compendious term 'Escomb fashion' as standing for this kind of

work wherever it appears. No feature that we shall have before us is so distinctively Saxon, but it has not secured the attention of the public to the extent that is the case with the similar treatment of external quoins, for this catches the eye at once and is generally hailed as the criterion par excellence of Anglo-Saxon work. Here, in the quoining, we have to deal with stones not, as in the jambs, similar in shape but differently used, but with stones of two different shapes, one that of a square pillar the other that of a comparatively thin slab. They are used in the following way. An upright pillar of stone, square in section and in height varying from about 2 ft. to 4 ft., is placed at the angle of the structure, it may be that of the tower, the nave, the chancel, or the porch, and over it is laid a flat slab of stone which grips into the wall and shows the length of its sides along the two faces. The correct designation of the work when the whole of it is seen would, as before, be 'upright and flat' rather than 'long and short,' but the latter term becomes appropriate when, as is often the case, the surface of the walls is plastered. With a view to plastering, which was a common perhaps a normal finish to Saxon walling, the wall-face was set back some half inch or so from the surface of the upright stones on the quoins and the plaster brought up flush with the edge of these. The parts of the flat slabs that lay along the walls were cut back level with the wall-faces and covered with the plaster so that only that portion of them was visible which corresponded with the width of the uprights. This portion was in height only the thickness of the slab and appeared 'short' in comparison with the 'long' upright pillars. Fig. 31 exhibits the technique in an example where the plaster has been stripped from the stonework. Were the plaster present the tailing of the flat piece into the wall would not be seen.

'Long and short' quoining has been mentioned here out of its proper place because it was undoubtedly of Roman derivation. The derivation was however, so far as we can

see, indirect, and as a fact it was never used in the earliest period of Anglo-Saxon architecture¹ when Roman forms in general were most in evidence but only in the later periods, in connection with which it will again come prominently into view.

The employment of cut-stone work and of rubble concrete for arches and vaults was familiar in this country as in other




FIG. 31, SE quoin of nave at Wittering, Northants, showing long and short work.

Romanized lands. The Roman bridges which must have been numerous need not in every nor indeed in any case have been arched, for piers of masonry with a superstructure of timber work would have sufficed for transit (Vol. I, 82). Portions of such stone piers survive and the best examples are those now to be seen at the passage of the North Tyne at Chollerford, Northumberland. The best existing Roman arch of stone-work in the solid 'opus quadratum' is the so-called Newport arch at Lincoln, the only complete gate of a Roman city that in this country still survives in situ and in use.

A small chamber vaulted with large stones roughly cut in voussoir form still exists at Cilurnum on the North Tyne, but Roman vaults in general were far more frequently in rubble or concrete than in cut stone. In our own country the existing remains of these are very scanty, and we possess nothing resembling the great vaults of the *Thermae* at Paris.

¹ See what is said about Heddon-on-the-Wall (p. 458).

For arches not in stone or concrete the use of flat bricks set edgeways, often in two rows one outside the other, is common, and these bricks are sometimes made in voussoir form thicker at one edge than at the one opposite. The alternation of bricks and stone voussoirs is common, and the stone used is sometimes tufa which the Romans, and after them the Normans, favoured for use in arches and vaults on account of its lightness. As regards openings it may be noted that doors and windows are usually cut straight through the wall in orthodox classical fashion. The recessed openings which occur at the so-called imperial palace at Trier have not been noticed in England, but a remarkable example of an internally splayed Roman window occurs at Cilurnum, Fig. 16, 3. The use of plaster is of course abundant. A special kind is made with pounded tiles and is red throughout, not merely flecked with the red of testacean fragments. It is very hard and impervious to water and is used for the lining of bath chambers and for floors as well as for the coating of walls generally. The term 'opus signinum' is commonly applied to it. The deeply scored tooling on Roman stones already referred to was perhaps originally intended to afford a key for plaster, though it appears on stones that never seem to have been thus coated. The wood-and-plaster partition walls mentioned (p. 49) have left their traces in some domestic buildings excavated at Silchester.¹

It will be convenient to notice here a point that stands to the credit of the early Saxon builder. In his use of plaster, cement, and concrete he preserved for a long time the good Roman technical traditions, and expert investigators have often borne testimony to the merits in this department of Saxon work. When the Early Saxon cathedral church at Rochester was first brought to light, it was reported 'that' (in the sleeper wall across the apse) 'the concrete was so hard that the ordinary picks were not stout enough to deal with it,

¹ *Archaeologia*, lvi, 243.

and that strong iron chisels had been specially made for the purpose.'¹ At Peterborough when the remains of the Anglo-Saxon Abbey church were discovered beneath the present crossing Mr Irvine, who as superintendent of works reported on what was found, praises the quality of the Saxon plaster and notes that the later Norman walling was built directly upon the Saxon plastered floor of the earlier church, which, 'though sunk down and crushed by the enormous weight, yet so remained that its crushed surface could be washed to find whether painting or incising had existed.'² At Avebury, Wilts, Saxon plastering on an external wall 'is composed of a fine white sand and is extremely hard.'³ It is noteworthy that quite thin Saxon walls will bear great superimposed weights of masonry, when towers are built upon earlier porches, as at Monkwearmouth (p. 126) and, probably, Bardsey, Yorks. (p. 191), and this is evidence of good technique and materials. For good Saxo-Roman plastering at St Martin, Canterbury see (p. 82) and at Reculver (p. 96).

Sufficient remains exist to show that Roman cities in Britain were supplied with handsome columnar edifices. Among these, basilicas seem to be chiefly represented, the remains of Roman temples that can be identified being very scanty. Bases, portions of shafts, and capitals of columns that were as much as 20 ft. to 30 ft. in height have been found, as at Lincoln, Wroxeter, and Bath. The capitals are sometimes debased corinthian but generally of a modified Roman doric, in which is apparent a tendency to elaborate the classical annulus into a series of mouldings. The bases are attic. In two mediaeval churches near the Roman Wall in Northumbria Roman monolithic column-shafts are used in the nave arcades. The churches are Chollerton on the North Tyne and Lanchester in County Durham. There are in all six complete shafts, 7 ft. or 8 ft. in height and about 5 ft. in girth, together

¹ *Arch. Cant.*, xviii, 263.

² *Ass.*, 1894, 47.

³ *Wilts Mag.*, xxi, 1884, 191.

with four others now half embedded in the walls to form responds. They are of sandstone, and are not brought to a finished surface, but are covered with tooling that seems partly Roman (Lanchester western respond) and partly mediaeval. One of them is shown in Fig. 174. In each case the outline of the shafts is so irregular that repeated testing with the straight edge and measuring tape leaves it doubtful whether there was any intention of giving them the classical taper and entasis, though there are some indications of these. The same phenomenon meets us in the interesting church of Ickleton in Cambridgeshire (p. 418) where there are four monolithic shafts about 7 ft. high that must have come from some Roman site.

One special class of columns calls for particular notice. These are small shafts some 3 ft. or 4 ft. high with attic bases and moulded caps that show distinct marks of having received their form by being turned in the lathe. This peculiarity is found in pieces of all sizes, and Mr G. E. Fox stated that 'in every Roman site in Britain where columns, or capitals, or bases are found, there is evidence of the lathe being used in forming them.'¹ Examples in the Leicester museum and at Chester exhibit this evidence very clearly. What these shafts were used for is not quite clear. There are plenty of roughly blocked pillar-like pieces on old Roman sites that formed the 'pilae' or supports of the upper floors of hypocausts, but the shafts in question are too finely wrought to be themselves pilae of this kind, though they often share with the hypocaust pillars a belying form. Mr Fox referred to them as 'dwarf columns the uses of which it is not easy to define,' and stated that 'those of small size were certainly occasionally employed as the supports of stone tables,'² while 'others of larger

¹ *Archaeological Journal*, XLVI, 48.

² In the Museum at Mainz one may be seen so employed, while at Silchester evidence of the same use was found. See *Archaeologia*, LIII, 280. In a Roman relief discovered in 1922 by the Mount at York a couch has legs of this kind, see (p. 261).

dimensions, placed on a dwarf wall, upheld the roofs of peristyles in domestic buildings . . . possibly they may have served . . . as dividing shafts to large window openings in gables.¹

Two specimens of these shafts are given in Figs. 32 and 33. One is a little shaft 3 ft. 3 in. high, with cap and base of orthodox though debased form, that occurs, re-used, in the belfry opening of the Saxon tower at Wickham, Berks ; the other, a roughly hewn stump, of about the same size, comes from Housesteads on the Northumbrian Wall.




FIG. 32, Roman shaft re-used in belfry stage of Saxon Church Tower, Wickham, Berks.




FIG. 33, Roman dwarf pillar at Housesteads on the Northumbrian Wall.

Shafts similar to these are sometimes introduced on a small scale as ornaments on carved stones such as tombstones or altars. These details, though they may seem in themselves insignificant, become of importance in connection with the hewn or turned baluster shafts of stone which occur in Saxon work of almost every date, and their significance will appear as we proceed.

Mosaic pavements, the tesserae of which are formed of native stones or small testaceous cubes, are common especially

¹ *Arch. Journ.*, LIV, 170.

in villas. The patterns of Roman mosaic pavements have a special interest in that they appear in some cases to have suggested motives which occur on sculptured stones and other forms of Old English ornamental art of Christian use and date. See Vol. v, 378 f. For the moment however we are only concerned with what belongs to the domain of architecture.

The foregoing technical notes are from secular or at any rate non-Christian structures. There is in this country one conspicuous instance of Roman construction applied to a Christian purpose in the frequently mentioned Early Christian




FIG. 34. Plan of Early Christian Basilican Church in the Roman City at Silchester, Hants. Copied by permission from *Archaeologia*, LIII.

basilican church excavated a few years ago at Silchester in Hants. Other fragments in existing early churches are claimed as Roman but their attribution is a matter of uncertainty, whereas at Silchester the work is undoubtedly Roman, and though it was once debated whether or not it be Christian, its ecclesiastical character is now universally recognized.

The situation of the structure in question in relation to the Roman city was shown in Vol. 1, Fig. 19, p. 146. Fig. 34 gives its plan indicated by the lower courses of the walls, which were laid bare in the year 1892, when the writer had an opportunity of seeing them, but were afterwards covered in. Their

material was flint rubble with brick quoins. The plan shows a narthex, a nave terminating in an apse, and side aisles ending in spaces marked off on either side of the apse, and projecting on the exterior beyond the line of the aisle walls. The building, the total exterior length of which was 42 ft., was oriented with its apse towards W, and this W orientation suits an early period, as the priest would minister standing with the altar between himself and the people and in this position would face E. The floor was laid with a pavement of red tile tesserae about an inch square, but in the centre of the apse was a square space in which was a mosaic pattern the date of which, from a comparison with other Roman mosaics, is estimated in the report in *Archaeologia*¹ as IV A.D. There was no trace of an altar or of any seat round the apse or at its central point, but the building may have had a wooden table-altar, which was the natural form at the period before relics came into fashion, and is the form indicated in the mosaic pictures of Christian altars of the middle of V in the Baptistry at Ravenna. The seats round the apse, if indeed there were space for any, may also have been of wood, and we may note that in the numerous Early Christian churches of N Africa the altars were also evidently of wood,² and no trace is now left of them save where the floor mosaic has preserved indications of the places where once they stood.

It is indeed somewhat remarkable that in several of the points in which Italian basilicas differ from those of N Africa and the East, Silchester agrees distinctly with the latter and not with the former. Its type is not Roman or Italian but rather N African or oriental. At Silchester there is a distinct narthex quite on an oriental plan, while the apse is flanked by two chambers of which that on N appears to open into the presbytery and so to correspond to the diaconicon or service-chamber universal in N Africa and the East, while the corre-

¹ LIII, 563.

² Gsell, *Les Monuments antiques de l'Algérie*, Paris, 1901, II, 145.

sponding chamber to S may answer to the prothesis, which in the regions just mentioned opens towards the church rather than the presbytery. The floor at Silchester was all on one level while in the African churches the presbytery is generally raised, and this constitutes a difference which does not however nullify the remarkable resemblances here noticed.

The little Silchester church, though quite a small building, possesses side aisles, and this would seem to show that by IV the basilican scheme was normal in the Christianized Roman West. The basilican scheme of the aisled church with an apsidal termination to the central nave was probably Constantinian, and represents an enlargement by the addition of side aisles of an earlier scheme in which a plain oblong aisleless interior is terminated by an apse. That this last would be the usual form for any building erected for the purposes of Christian worship during the ages of persecution is a plausible hypothesis, and it received striking confirmation a few years ago in the discovery at the basilican church of S. Saba on the Aventine at Rome that the first form of the building had been on the plan just indicated, and that subsequently the side walls had been levelled to their lowest courses and on these as foundations had been reared colonnades giving access to newly built side aisles. This addition of side aisles to aisleless interiors would be called for in the age of Constantine, when the personnel of the Christian community was enormously increased in numbers and in material resources, and the form became established wherever Roman influence was paramount. It is noteworthy however, and this is a fact of capital importance, that in Britain the form though introduced at the early date attested by Silchester, did not obtain currency. Of the two Canterbury churches¹ for which there is evidence of a pre-Saxon origin, Christ Church afterwards the cathedral, and St Martin, the former seems to have been basilican the latter

¹ The Kentish churches referred to on this and the succeeding page are dealt with in the fourth Chapter.

not, while of the four other early Kentish churches of VII connected with the Augustinian mission that have left remains only Reculver is basilican, St Peter and St Paul (p. 86 f.), St Pancras, Rochester, and Lyminge having aisleless naves though the width of some of these is greater than that of basilican Silchester. In fact these first churches of Saxon England, built as they were under the most pronounced Roman influence, seem to start the tradition of the aisleless nave which is maintained in force all through the Saxon period.

What happened in Christendom generally in the time of Constantine seems to have been repeated in England after the Norman Conquest. The Normans were zealous churchmen, and in very many cases they added side aisles to existing single-naved churches of Anglo-Saxon provenance, carrying out their purpose ingeniously by cutting arches through the existing Saxon side walls, and so preserving the fabric while they could almost double the interior accommodation. The fact that early Norman side aisles are often extremely narrow, for example Ickleton, Cambs. (p. 418), shows indeed that it was not a mere question of accommodation but of a penchant for the basilican scheme which appealed to the Normans but did not attract the Anglo-Saxon builder. See on this point (p. 233). In any case it was the fact that to judge by the quite fair criterion of existing remains basilican churches were exceptional in Anglo-Saxon times, though they became so common afterwards, and though the greater churches were as a rule no doubt basilican, yet taking the country as a whole the aisleless interior, so far as we can tell, greatly preponderated in pre-Conquest Britain.

When this terminated in an apse we have proof of direct Roman influence, for the apse is unknown in early Celtic times. The early Celtic builders understood curved forms and used them in their beehive huts, and also in certain oratories which were rounded inside though square on the

exterior, Fig. 21, A, but they never used the shape for the exterior form of their distinct altar houses which were always rectangular. It does not follow from this that the square ends of most Anglo-Saxon churches and of later mediaeval British churches in general are merely to be explained by Celtic examples. The English preference for square ends may partly or even wholly be interpreted as due to a curious shyness in the matter of vaulting, a finish which the apse insistently demands but which in England it did not always receive. The English builders differ here from the Scottish, who have always used vaulting much more freely both in domestic and in ecclesiastical surroundings, and the difference may be due to an infusion in the North of Celtic stone-building traditions which were wanting in the Anglo-Saxon Midlands and South. At any rate there falls to be noticed the very curious fact that, speaking generally, the Anglo-Saxon builders, though under the excellent tuition of Roman models, never seem to have mastered intelligently the methods of arch and vault construction. The task of cutting stone voussoirs and of setting these or tile-shaped bricks seems to have opened to them pitfalls into which at all times they were prone to stumble. It is a parallel case to what happened in Greek and Roman painting, where, though admirable qualities in design and line drawing are exhibited, the artists generally never seem to have mastered the simplest rules of perspective. In like manner some of the Anglo-Saxon builders are almost ludicrously helpless in face of the problem of cutting voussoirs for a round arch—a problem to be solved in a few minutes by drawing out the arch on the ground by the use of a revolving radius, and employing this same radius to give the form of the vaulting stones—while their tentative devices afford a useful criterion to separate their latest work from that of the Normans, who were quite *au fait* at arch technique. This point, though in itself it may seem trivial, possesses chronological importance, and it is moreover so characteristic of the

casual Anglo-Saxon ways of building, that it may be justifiable here to devote a little space to its elucidation.

It agrees with what has just been called the 'in-and-out running' of the Anglo-Saxons to find them sometimes setting to work in a more or less business-like fashion, while at other times or elsewhere they are all at sea. Thus, to take the use of Roman tiles set edgeways to form an arch, in an example of X at Britford near Salisbury, Roman tile-shaped bricks re-used are employed. Some of these are voussoir shaped as is seen in the lowest one at the springing of the arch in Fig. 35, and it is characteristic that, while this one




FIG. 35, Jamb of opening at Britford, Wilts.

is properly laid, there are others in the arch that are set with the thick end and not the thin end inwards. In the setting of these, and of other tiles that are not voussoir shaped, the necessary wedge form is secured by pads of mortar thicker on the extrados than on the intrados, and the whole work passes muster fairly well from the technical point of view. At Brixworth in Northamptonshire in VII arches had to be formed with Roman bricks all of the plain flat shape,

and though the period was nearly three centuries nearer to the Roman times the constructors had no idea of how to begin, but started with a great wedge shaped pad of mortar, which of course gave the first tile which leant up against it a greatly exaggerated tilt, Fig. 36. In the case of stone voussoirs we find this same crude device adopted, as in the quite early and well wrought outer arch of the Anglo-Saxon W porch at

Titchfield, Hants, now carried up to form a tower. Here the lowest stone of the arch is wedged up in the same fashion. In the tower arch of the Late Saxon church at Bosham, near Chichester, Sussex, the first three stones on N are laid quite flat and only cut on their soffit surfaces to the curve of the arch which is of a slightly horseshoe form. The wedge shaped voussoirs begin with the fourth stone (Fig. 150). In the oldest portion of the ruins of Restennet Priory, Forfarshire,




FIG. 36, Springing of arch
at Brixworth.




FIG. 37, Arch at Ampney
St Peter, Gloucestershire.

which with the well known St Regulus tower at St Andrews has to be considered in connection with Late Saxon work of the so-called 'Saxo-Norman overlap' (p. 441 f.), Dr Kelly of Aberdeen has pointed out that the cutting of the voussoirs at the springing of the ancient arch is very abnormal. Another example of crudity is to be found in the tower arch of the W tower at Ampney St Peter, near Cirencester, Gloucestershire, a church not generally suspected of Saxon affinities. This arch is in a wall only about 2 ft. thick. It has no keystone,

and the voussoirs run right through the thickness of the wall. The cutting of them is however quite erratic, and the arch starts on N with a wedge shaped stone the slant of which is far too steep for the width of the arch which is 8 ft., and this stone is followed by one that is not wedge shaped at all, Fig. 37. Often enough, it is true, the voussoir stones are properly cut and fitted with the lines of their joints duly pointing to the centre from which the semicircle of the arch was struck, but even here we find curious irregularities in the sizes of the stones which looks unsystematic. See for example Winstone, Gloster, Fig. 182. It is rarely too that the Saxon




FIG. 38, Arch at Wootton Wawen, Warwickshire.

arch boasts a keystone, though on the E face of the E tower arch of the central tower at Wootton Wawen, Warwickshire, there is one that is emphasized by its projection of $1\frac{1}{2}$ in. from the face of the wall. This is certainly Saxon but is an abnormal detail. The mason has sometimes tried to help himself at the point where he seems to have felt difficulty by using at the springing of the arch high stones cut on both soffit and extrados to the required curve of the arch, as in the example Fig. 38,

from the N tower opening at Wootton Wawen, where the two stones at the springing are nearly 2 ft. high and are through-stones.

This last expression needs a word of explanation. Saxon walls are as a rule thin, and it may be suggested that they were derived from the Roman partition or party walls used in the interiors of stations and in villas. Such a Roman wall is shown Fig. 39 in juxtaposition with a ruined piece of early Saxon walling that used to be exposed at Sockburn-on-Tees, near Darlington, Fig. 40. In both cases the stones are rough

and of quite a moderate size and are laid with their largest and best face outwards, two stones forming practically the thickness of the wall. In openings, as we have seen, the fashion we have asked the reader's leave to call 'Escomb fashion' (p. 54) was in fairly common use, and when jambs so constructed were joined by an arch of stonework it became the custom to make the voussoirs run through the whole thickness of the thin wall, as was the case with the upright slabs on the jambs. This peculiarity in arch construction is important in the later Saxon period as it




FIG. 39, Slight Roman wall at Chesters.




FIG. 40, Saxon wall at Sockburn-on-Tees.
The wall is c. 2 ft. 4 in. thick.

separates Saxon arches from those of the Normans who built with thicker walls put together in quite a different fashion (p. 28).

A certain want of capacity for constructing arches of any considerable span, of which the early Saxon builders seem to have been conscious, may have led them to the plan of subdividing wide openings, of which examples

will presently be shown. In the later periods however chancel and tower arches of 10 or 12 ft. or more in aperture are freely constructed, as at St Mary Bishophill Junr. at York, where

the arch is quite a noble architectural feature 10 ft. wide and nearly 16 ft. high. At Worth, Sussex, the span of the chancel arch is 14 ft. 1 in., its height 22 ft. At Stow, Lincolnshire, the piers of the tower opening stand more than 15 ft. apart. Taking however the style as a whole, the very common though not universal narrowness of Saxon openings, exaggerated at Bradford-on-Avon (p. 303) and at the neighbouring Limpley Stoke (pp. 303, 466), may be due to this timidity.

If the Saxons were weak in the construction of single arches, their failure before the problem of vaulting was complete, and it has been suggested above that it was this, quite as much as Celtic example, which accounts for the square ends of Saxon churches. Only one Anglo-Saxon vault above ground remains to us, that over the porch at Monkwearmouth, County Durham. The few others are in crypts, and are, like the porch vault, of barrel form. In only one case, the crypt at Repton, Derbyshire, is any indication of groined vaulting to be seen, and that seems tentative or even accidental (p. 316).

To set against these indications of comparative inability, we have to note certain innovations on the simple classical or Celtic plans that were pregnant with consequences of much importance for our insular architecture. These concern the use of porches and side chapels, which in themselves at first small and unimportant were the beginnings of a development of tower construction and placing, and of transepts and cruciform plans, on which the effect of our more advanced mediaeval churches has always depended. We find also among the earlier Anglo-Saxon churches indications of the early use of galleries over side aisles, that did not belong to the earliest basilican scheme but were later on added to some of the basilicas, especially at Rome, and became in Romanesque times among the most productive elements in the evolution of advanced mediaeval architecture (pp. 176, 179 f.).

Roman and Celtic traditions, re-inforced by direct influ-

ences from abroad when the conversion of the Saxons brought them into touch with the older seats of Christianity, supplied the new devotees with the material for expressing their fresh enthusiasm in the building of churches. The work began before the close of VI, and all through the course of VII there was a prolific activity in this department wherever Christianity was established in power. A fair number of the buildings have at any rate in part come down to us, and they can in a satisfactory number of cases be dated on unimpeachable literary evidence. In the case of other examples there is good ground for deducing an early date from the extensive use in them of Roman materials and their close copying of Roman methods and details. In the case of some VII buildings that have entirely disappeared there exist literary records early enough and sufficiently clear to enable us to include them in a historical survey, such records being of course always critically reviewed. The period of this earliest group of Saxon churches is given as VII, though early VIII may be included, because as a fact this was a great church building era, while when we pass into later VIII and IX we shall find that examples which can be located with any assurance are very few and far between, if indeed they exist at all. This contrast is a matter for future notice.

It is not to be supposed that the churches we shall presently have before us are anything more than a fractional part of those that had been erected before the end of the first decade or two of VIII. Bede mentions the foundation of more than sixty churches or monastic establishments.¹ Each of these last possessed its church, and in the case of monasteries of importance, animated with missionary zeal, we may assume as typical the procedure at Lindisfarne from which as off-shoots 'churches were built in divers places,'² or at Canter-

¹ These are enumerated and located on a map of England in a valuable paper by Mr Gordon Hills in *Ass.*, xxiv, 1868, p. 360.

² Bede, *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 3.

bury, where 'when the king had been converted to the faith' the monks 'obtained greater liberty to preach everywhere and to build or repair churches.'¹ Brixworth, now the most imposing of all the VII churches that have left us monumental remains, was such a colony from the mother monastery of Medeshamstede or Peterborough.

The whole subject of the conditions, political, social, and religious, under which the earliest Saxon churches were founded have been sufficiently discussed in Chapter VII of Vol. I, where also the possible connections of these churches with early British Christian oratories or even with pagan Roman or Saxon temples is the subject of a few paragraphs, Vol. I, 251 f., 267 f. The point which it is desired to emphasize here is the considerable number of the churches in question. It has been used as an argument against the early date of Escomb, in Durham, that it is not mentioned in Bede. It was not however possible for the historian to name anything like all the religious monuments that were in existence in his time, and it was only the monastic establishments where ecclesiastical history was in making that supplied him with material for his pages.

¹ Bede, *Hist. Eccl.*, I, 26.

CHAPTER IV

EARLY CHURCHES OF THE KENTISH GROUP

THE CHURCHES of the first Saxon architectural period, practically VII, that are either represented by actual remains or are clearly described, number nearly a score. At Canterbury there are four. (I) The earliest church on the site of the present Cathedral, called Christ Church, a building that has left no actual traces but is clearly described in a later form of it that incorporated earlier elements. (II) St Martin, said by Bede to be a survival from British Christian times. (III) The obviously very early chapel known as St Pancras. (IV) The church connected with the monastery of St Augustine, dedicated at first to SS. Peter and Paul, but associated afterwards with the name by which it is most commonly called. (V) At Rochester enough has been found to reconstitute a bishop's church of the early years of the 7th century, and (VI) there are portions of a church of the period at Lyminge, Kent. (VII) At Reculver, on the edge of Thanet, there are considerable remains of a monastic church of the latter part of the century. All these are in Kent.¹

(VIII) Essex affords us the interesting but somewhat enigmatical structure called St Peter-on-the-Wall, near Bradwell, on the site of the Roman coast fortress known as Othona. It possesses very early features and is of a Kentish type, but its exact history is uncertain. (IX) In the Midlands there is the

¹ Bede also, *Hist. Eccl.*, II, 7, mentions incidentally an early church of the Four Crowned Martyrs at Canterbury but we know nothing of it. We are only concerned with buildings that have architectural interest, and there is no attempt here to catalogue all recorded examples.

important example of Brixworth, a few miles N of Northampton, that can be dated about 680, and some would add Peterborough, where Saxon remains, on a plan of ample size, underlie part of the existing Norman shrine. There is great doubt however as to the age of these since older Saxon materials are re-used in the walling, and it is best to defer consideration of this interesting fragment (p. 168 f.). The same may be said about the chapel dedicated to St Patrick at Heysham on Morecambe Bay, Lancashire. It has Celtic affinities, and represents the simple type of the oblong cell without distinct altar house noticed above (p. 42), but definite indications which would place it in this group of monuments are not in evidence. On the other hand (X) Stone-by-Faversham, though only a fragment, exhibits definite marks in very early, some would say Roman or Romano-British, technique. The ruins of the church called by this name lie in a copse near the Roman road and the railway between Faversham and Sittingbourne, Kent, a little W of Ospringe. The example of Abingdon (XI) must not be omitted, for though there are no existing remains of the first abbey church on this site an important literary notice concerning it has been preserved.

If in the earliest decades of the 7th century and even before its inception Kent was the chief Christian centre in the country, in the latter portion of it the primacy was held by Northumbria. Of this the first religious capital was Lindisfarne, but from about 675 onwards the main artistic centre was Hexham, and the church erected there by Wilfrid in the last quarter of the century seems from the accounts we possess of it to have been about the most important architectural achievement of the whole period. (XII) and (XIII) are the two churches built about the same date, say 675 to 680, at the twin monasteries of Monkwearmouth and Jarrow-on-Tyne, at both of which places early remains are extant. (XIV) Escomb, near Bishop Auckland, in Durham, is one of the most perfect and in some respects most interesting Anglo-Saxon churches in the whole

country. (XV) The important site of Corbridge-on-Tyne near Hexham, adjoining the great Roman station of *Cor-stopitum* excavated within the last two decades, has preserved an interesting Anglian church that may safely be placed in this first period. (XVI) There were notable early bishop's churches at York for which we have to rely on literary accounts. The earliest actual remains are to be seen in the crypt of the present Minster, and consist in two masses of herring-bone masonry one on each side of the crypt at its W end, and about 27 ft. apart. The walls are composed of stones measuring about 9 in. by 3 in. and are of very substantial thickness, in parts 4 ft. 8 in. The general appearance of the work accords with an Early Norman date, and there is nothing about it that looks Saxon. Of the Saxon bishop's church however that existed on the site about 780 we have a poetical description that is clear enough to justify our placing it on this list. (XVII) At Ripon in Yorkshire there remains almost intact the crypt of the church built there by Wilfrid between 670 and 680, and this cannot be disconnected from (XVIII) and (XIX) Wilfrid's two ambitious structures at Hexham about which there is much that can be said and which may be regarded as summing up the architectural achievements of this first period, A. Though we have to depend almost entirely on literary accounts these are important enough to justify a somewhat extended treatment in Chapter vi.

The buildings here enumerated exhibit considerable variety in their form and arrangements, and show the working alike of Roman and of Celtic traditions. In Kent, as would be expected, Roman elements are all-important, while in Northumbria, though Roman memories were kept alive by the great monuments which still after nearly two thousand years impress the beholder, the way was open through Lindisfarne for the infiltration of Celtic forms and ideas. Almost all these buildings however exhibit unconventional features which show that the Anglo-Saxon builder was no mere copyist

but sought for means of independent architectural expression, and evolved his own devices for meeting the needs of the ecclesiastical communities for whom he laboured. He may have done this in amateurish experimental fashion, and shown thereby that he was not endowed with the true architectural sense accorded so bountifully by nature to the later Norman builders. He worked however with spirit and vigour, and the reader will have no difficulty in following his operations in a sympathetic mood.

In the case of two of the Canterbury churches mentioned by Bede, Christ Church and St Martin, the historian intimates that they were of Romano-British origin, and that St Martin had been brought back to Christian use for Æthelbert's Frankish consort Bertha before the coming of Augustine, while on the other hand the church of SS. Peter and Paul in the Augustinian monastery was erected by the king from the foundation for the use of the Roman missionaries. A late tradition also gave a pre-Augustinian origin to St Pancras, but it is better to regard it as built afresh by the new comers, probably for use before the greater church of the suburban monastery was ready to receive them.¹

(I) The Saxon cathedral at Canterbury is known from descriptions of XII date, which give the form that the building had assumed before the conflagration of 1067. This form however evidently embodied very early features, to which great additions had been made in subsequent times. The complete scheme was evolved from the descriptions by Professor Willis who interpreted the documentary evidence with his usual sagacity.² The plan here offered, Fig. 41, is based on that of Professor Willis, but there have been introduced

¹ Sir W. St John Hope, in *Archaeologia Cantiana*, xxv, 235. It is definitely stated in the *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis*, Rolls Series, no. 8, p. 80, of St Pancras, haec est prima ecclesia a nostro in Christo protoparente et pontifice dedicata.

² *The Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral*, Lond., 1845.

some slight modifications. Thus, at the lower sinister corner of the plan there is indicated a baptistry, or chapel of St John, which we are told was erected in the middle of VIII, and this has been made cruciform instead of octagonal, for the cruciform scheme was traditional for the funereal chapel,¹ as at Ravenna and Constantinople, and Cuthbert who built it had in his mind specially the funereal intention,² though it was to be used also for baptisms and other more secular purposes




FIG. 41, Saxon Cathedral at Canterbury.

for which the cruciform scheme would be more convenient as supplying 'porticus.'

Again, the porch-towers, with the chapel of St Gregory below the S porch-tower, have been altered somewhat in position and arrangements. Eadmer, as quoted by Willis, p. 9, note y, says that these were placed 'sub medio longitudinis aulae . . . prominentes ultra ecclesiae alas,' the last word making it clear that the church was basilican. The words 'sub medio' have been taken here to mean 'near the middle' not 'beyond' it, and they have been thus placed, while their

¹ Vol. I, p. 166.

² Willis, l.c., p. 2. See also (p. 90 f.).

internal arrangements have been made to fit those of other Saxon porch-chapels, such as Bishopstone (p. 193). The plan of the crypt, indicated by dotted lines and the letters A, B, C, has been drawn on a somewhat different scheme from that indicated in Willis's commentary.

The main features of the structure are distinctly indicated in the documents. It possessed 'alae' or aisles, an apse at E over the crypt, and various altars and flights of steps all clearly indicated in the original authorities which are printed by Willis in the opening pages of his work. There is no absolute indication that the church terminated towards W in an apse, but the description makes this almost certain.¹

The question how the building came to assume the form indicated on the plan is one to which a little attention may be directed. Bede tells us that Augustine recovered in Canterbury a church which he had learned was originally constructed by the labour of Roman believers, and constituted this as his episcopal seat.² We have reason therefore to assume that the oldest part of the church was pre-Augustinian, though Augustine may have added to or altered it. The baptistry or chapel of St John was erected by Archbishop Cuthbert, 740-758, while Archbishop Odo, 940-960, restored and heightened the edifice and modified the arrangement of the altars. Finally the church was ruined by a conflagration in 1067, and its remains seem to have been entirely cleared away by Lanfranc.

With the case of Silchester before us we may readily credit the pre-Augustinian church with a western orientation, and the fact that the W end at Canterbury was raised some steps

¹ Rivoira, *Lombardic Architecture*, II, 152, thought this apse merely an invention of Willis, but the description of the pontifical chair as at the extreme W end of the main wall of the building, with the altar standing out at some distance E of it so that the priest stood behind the altar and faced the people as he ministered, is so exactly the arrangement of the normal Early Christian basilica that an apse is almost a necessary inference,

² *H.E.*, I, 33.

above the body of it, though there was no crypt in that part, may be explained on the analogy of the churches of N Africa where this raising of the altar end is not infrequent.¹ At Canterbury as we have just seen the episcopal throne was against the W wall of the church, and the altar was away from the wall in front of it, an arrangement normal in the earliest Christian edifices. We may regard therefore this W part of the Canterbury church as a relic of Romano-British Christianity, while the basilican arrangement of nave and aisles may also be referred to the same source.² The lateral adjuncts however with the S door, reminding us as they do on the one hand of St Pancras and on the other of later Saxon plans, would appear to be additions made probably in VII. At this time the adjuncts would at most be only porch-chapels, not towers. The S door, a later feature than the lateral chapel, may have been pierced in the S wall of the chapel at a subsequent date.

This suggestion for the early history of the church is borne out by the fact that the baptistry of VIII was erected at its E end. There is no reason for a baptistry to be placed toward any particular point of the compass, but there is a reason why the arrangements for this rite of admission to the Christian community should be located at the entrance end of churches. Hence we may infer that the E end of the church was at this time its place of entrance. Odo in the extensive works he carried out, which are said to have occupied three years, re-roofed the edifice and renewed and raised the upper part of the walls. Though we are not told that he altered the E end, we may conjecture that the apse in this part, with the crypt and confessio below it, was his work. Such a crypt was impossible at the Romano-British epoch, though it might

¹ Gsell, *Les Monuments antiques de l'Algérie*, II, 138.

² If Odo in X had added aisles to a single-celled church some mention would have been made of this in the notice of his work. At the time he took it in hand it is indicated as the largest church in the city.

have been constructed in Augustine's time or in VIII. In either case the eastern would have ceased then to be the side of entrance, and the location there at the latter epoch of the baptistry would be unlikely. The E apse and crypt are probably therefore later than the baptistry.

The form of the crypt was evidently that of a curved passage, BB on the plan, following the line of the apse and communicating with a chamber or confessio, c, at the E limit. Such passages and chambers are found in Italy at an early date,¹ but there is an example at Werden a. d. Ruhr in Rhenish Prussia that belongs to IX. Not only the plan for the crypt, but the arrangement of the E end generally, might well have been derived by Odo from Austrasia, for such a duplication of the apse, by repeating it at the end of the building opposite to the original one, was in later times a characteristic Austrasian feature (p. 232). At the same time that Odo heightened the walls of the church he may have built towers on the walls of the already existing lateral porches.

(II) If we accept then the W end of Christ Church as Romano-Christian it will be natural to take the other example noted by Bede of this survival, the world-famous little suburban church of St Martin on the hill E of Canterbury, where Bertha worshipped, and where her lord was baptized though certainly not in the receptacle now exhibited in the nave. The church consists now in a square W tower, nave, and long square ended chancel, and the nave and the W part of the chancel are clearly of pre-Conquest date. There is some evidence, discussed in detail in the work on the church by Canon Routledge,² that this W part of the chancel was the original church. It is supposed to have terminated towards E in an apse and to have extended westwards into the part which is now the nave so as to form in this way a plain round ended chapel. Later

¹ St Peter, Rome, of doubtful date; S. Apollinare in Classe, Ravenna, VI or VII; SS. Quattro Coronati, Rome, IX; Torcello, by Venice, etc.

² *The Church of St Martin, Canterbury*, London, 1898.

additions and alterations brought the church to its present shape as shown in the plan, Fig. 42. In this plan, the work of the Rev. Canon Greville M. Livett, which is here copied with the kind permission of Canon Routledge from his book, the supposed original nucleus of the structure is sufficiently indicated, and an examination of the building in its existing condition demonstrates the high antiquity of the W part of the chancel.

The present S wall of this, 2 ft. 2 in. thick, is composed almost entirely of Roman brick laid with fair regularity.




FIG. 42, Plan of St Martin, Canterbury, showing supposed original form of the church in the present chancel. (Special scale.)

About half-way along the present extended chancel wall there is a projecting buttress of the same material (now a good deal modernized) and immediately to E of this there is a straight joint in the brickwork showing where the original chapel ended. Of the two doorways, now blocked, in this wall, the round headed one is a later insertion and has sloping jambs with an arch head wider than the jambs. The flat headed one at the SW corner is probably original, and may have given access to a small lateral chapel. The E part of the present chancel is much later. On account of the disturbances caused by interments within the chancel it has been impossible to ascertain decisively whether or not the original chancel really ended apsidally, though this is rendered highly probable

by the treatment of the SE corner where there is the buttress on S but none on E, though there would have been one here also had the chancel ended in a straight E wall.¹

The nave of St Martin is also Saxon, or at any rate pre-Conquest, but the walls of it are of ruder construction than those of the chancel, though they exhibit very distinct survivals of Roman technique. One of these consists in a patch of red plastering, visible near the little piscina at the SE corner of the nave, and it appears that there are considerable pieces of this material behind the woodwork of the pews. This plastering, made with pounded brick, is hard and of good quality, and might in itself be termed a specimen of the opus signinum of the Romans. Another significant feature was only displayed to view when the W wall of the nave was recently denuded of its plaster. Here have come to light marks of three openings which had been walled up ; one, in the centre, is a large arched opening, about 7 ft. 6 in. in width, with its crown about 17 or 18 ft. from the floor, the object of which is problematical, and the other two are splayed windows, about 4 ft. 6 in. high, the outer openings of which are permanently concealed by the walls of the mediaeval tower. These windows have jambs composed mainly of blocks of chalk, and round heads turned in Roman bricks and voussoirs of Kentish rag buried in abundant mortar. The peculiarity here is that this mortar is of the pink kind, composed in part of pounded brick, while that of the walling generally is white. There would be no special significance in this but for the fact that precisely the same peculiarity occurs in the original arched openings in the Roman Pharos at Dover Castle, which are turned in mortar mingled with crushed tiles, while in the fabric generally the mortar is white. It is enough to record these facts, the historical purport of which cannot here be discussed.

(III) Next in order of the Canterbury churches comes that

¹ The example of St Pancras presently to be noticed shows that this would have been the case.

known as St Pancras. The remains of it lie E of the church of St Augustine's monastery in what used to be the grounds




FIG. 43, Plan of St Pancras, Canterbury.

of the Kent and Canterbury Hospital. The ground plan, Fig. 43, will be seen at once to promise features of novelty and interest, as it is an aisleless apsidal church subdivided in

remarkable fashion and possessing adjuncts to W, S, and N. The main body of the building is an oblong measuring internally about 42 ft. 8 in. by 26 ft. 9 in., and it will be observed that the W quoins are buttressed, each wall being carried out for the purpose beyond the quoin. Two similar buttresses or pilasters flanked the original wide entrance doorway at W end that measures 7 ft. 6 in. Particular notice should be taken of these buttresses as the feature is so rare in pre-Conquest work (p. 239). They are of the same width as the thickness of the walls, which is never more than about 1 ft. 9 in., and they project 1 ft. 2 in. They occur on each side of the angles to which they give strength, compare St Martin (p. 81), and are in bond with the fabric of the walls. At the E end the oblong cella was terminated by a screen of columns or a wall, with a wide archway about 9 ft. in span in the centre, giving admission to a presbytery or chancel the walls of which, enclosing a space rather less in width than the nave or cella, were carried on parallel lines for some 15 ft. and then came together in the form of a wide apse, possibly of semi-elliptical plan, that terminated the whole interior. A buttress marked on the exterior the point where the curve of the apse began. Only the portions marked in black on the plan have actually been recovered and the rest is more or less conjectural.

The material is Roman brick, re-used, with the original Roman mortar in many cases still adhering to the surface, and these bricks or fragments of bricks are laid in two kinds of mortar, one yellow which was used in the beginning of the work, and the other white with fragments of sea-shells in it, that was employed later, but still before the fabric was more than half completed. The bricks are sometimes of triangular form and laid with the points inward according to a familiar Roman fashion.

Furthermore, the building has three adjuncts in the form of a W porch and two lateral chapels to which attention must be paid. Each of these features possesses in Saxon archi-

ecture a special importance over and above its own form and use. The W porch, as will be seen later on, is closely connected with the conspicuous feature of the W tower, while the side-chapel leads us on to the transept and is associated in this way with the development of the cruciform plan. At St Pancras the walls of these three adjuncts, as is shown on the plan, are not in bond with those of the main building, and they are constructed with the white mortar that signifies a slight posteriority in date. Such at any rate is the case at the lowest part of the walls, as for example where the walls of the W porch are built up against the pilasters that flank the W door. The N wall of this porch is however preserved to a considerable elevation, and it can be seen that, after the height of about 3 ft. has been reached, the joint between the porch wall and the pilaster disappears and both are carried up together with no division. This points to the explanation that the porch was an afterthought but that it was taken in hand before the work on the main building had proceeded far. The same is probably the case with the two lateral chapels. They are not, so far as can be seen, in bond with the main walls, but, as in all the rest of the building save the N wall of the porch, only a few of the lower courses of the walling are preserved. Higher up they may have been bonded in like the W adjunct. Of these lateral chapels only that on S has been preserved, but there are indications which show that there was once a corresponding structure on N. The S chapel contains against its E wall the relics of a later mediaeval altar that is of special interest for us as it appears to be referred to by a writer of XIV, who tells to us about the altar and the building generally a noteworthy but perhaps hardly credible story.

The writer in question is one William Thorn, a monk of the monastery of St Augustine, within the precincts of which the chapel we are dealing with is situated. He tells us that at this place King Æthelbert before his conversion possessed a temple or idol house, and that Augustine purged this temple

from its impurities and changed it into a church dedicating it in the name of St Pancras.¹ 'There is still an altar,' Thorn goes on, 'in the south porch² of the same church at which the same Augustine was wont to celebrate . . .' and it is evident from what he goes on to tell us that the chapel and altar had a traditional sanctity in later mediaeval days which gives them a certain importance in our eyes. Thorn's statement that the building was originally, or at any rate at one time, a pagan temple is of more immediate moment.

This same statement has been made in earlier and in later days about not a few of the oldest-looking of our Saxon churches especially in Kent. It has never in the case of any one been proved, and the tendency nowadays is to discredit any suggestions of the kind. It is quite possible that the notion to which Thorn gave currency was a mediaeval guess, founded on the fact that antique Roman columns, or portions of these, were to be seen as part of the fabric at the E end of the nave.

(IV) We come now to the church of SS. Peter and Paul, which was erected from the foundations on a new site by King Æthelbert in connection with Augustine's monastery. It was begun in 598 but not completed till 613. Till the last few years it was only a name, though mediaeval writers told us interesting things about it, but from 1900 onwards extensive excavations, not yet (1924) completed, have laid bare the foundations of the chief buildings connected with the mediaeval abbey of St Augustine.³ Under the remains of the great Norman church there came to light various structures of pre-Conquest date some of which go back to the earliest building period. A useful resumé of the architectural story of the

¹ For the reason of this dedication, see Vol. I, p. 279.

² *Chronica de rebus gestis Abbatum Sancti Augustini*, § 5; in Twysden, *Decem Scriptores*, Lond., 1652, p. 1760. 'Extat adhuc altare in porticu ejusdem ecclesiae australi,' etc.

³ To the Rev. R. U. Potts, M.A., Bursar of St Augustine's College, who has throughout directed and watched the investigations, the writer returns cordial thanks for explanations kindly given on the spot.

site is given in *Archaeologia Cantiana*, xxxv. St Pancras may have been the first religious building. Then came the main church and this was followed about 616 by the erection by Æthelbert's son Eadbald of a chapel of St Mary between the abbey church and St Pancras which, as we have seen, lay E of this. The abbey church was enlarged both in length and breadth in the time of Dunstan, but apart from this nothing of importance for our purpose transpired till the latest Saxon period, when, about 1050, Abbot Wulfric II started a grand scheme for joining up the two earlier buildings, the Peter-Paul abbey church and the chapel of St Mary. To effect this he took down the E end of the former and the W end of the last named, and erected on the space 'a new central building, octagonal without and round within, with a circle of pillars in the centre, possibly with the intention of making a grand new tomb of St Augustine.' This important Late Saxon edifice will be noticed on a later page. Here it is enough to note that Wulfric's work partly destroyed and partly overlay the E parts of the church of Æthelbert. After the Conquest the first Norman Abbot, Scotland, determined on a new church which he began at the E end by taking down what survived of the chapel of St Mary and levelling Wulfric's round church down to the lowest courses. He then built a fine crypt with a presbytery above it and continued the work westwards as far as the second bay of the nave, when his death in 1087 interrupted his labours. His successor, Wydo, completed the nave, but his work involved also a drastic treatment of some of the most important features of the earliest Saxon structures on the spot. He carried out a solemn translation of the bodies of Augustine and his successors with those of other notable personages from their original resting places in the Saxon abbey church to new seats in the great Norman edifice. Of this translation there exists a contemporary account drawn up seven years after the event, that is before the end of XI, by an eyewitness of it, Gocelin, a monk of St Bertin, who was then

living at St Augustine's. The MS. is in the British Museum, Cott. Vesp. B. XX. It has been printed by the Bollandists, May 26, and in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, clv, but a new critical edition, embodying the monumental evidence that has recently come to light, is of course a desideratum.

Overlaid as it is, first by the work of Wulfric, and then by the immense sleeper walls that carried the arcades flanking the Norman nave, enough remains of Æthelbert's church to make it an object of great architectural and ecclesiological interest. We are told by Bede¹ that Augustine 'made also a monastery not far from the same city (Canterbury) towards the east, in which, by his persuasion, Æthelbert built from the foundations and enriched with divers gifts the church of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, in which the bodies both of Augustine himself and of all the bishops of Durovernum, as well as those of the Kings of Kent, could be placed.' And he tells us (*H.E.*, II, 3) that when Augustine died in 605 his body was retained for a time outside the church which was not yet completed but was ultimately brought in and buried 'in porticu illius aquilonali,' in which place also subsequent archbishops were laid, till the time came of Theodore and Berctuald, who were buried in 'ipsa ecclesia' because the 'porticus' was then full. This 'porticus' had near the middle of it an altar dedicated to St Gregory. We also learn (*H.E.*, II, 5) that the corresponding southern 'porticus' consecrated to St Martin was the royal mausoleum and contained the bones of Æthelbert, Bertha, Eadbald and others.


Before the excavations the meaning in these passages of 'porticus' was doubtful, and even now, when we know exactly what the word referred to, the English equivalent of it is not easy to fix. St Pancras had introduced us to side chapels built out to N and S of a church, as well as to projecting porches of entry, and side chapels or porches formed part of the plan of Christ Church, Canterbury, one of which porches

¹ *Hist. Eccl.*, I, 33.

was dedicated to St Gregory. Hence it seemed natural to assume outbuildings of a similar kind arranged for sepulchral purposes at St Augustine, and writing about 1902 in *Arch. Cant.*, xxv, 223, Sir W. St John Hope uses the words '*porticus* or chapel' for the place of burial of the archbishops. In his paper however of 1915 in *Archaeologia* the word 'chapel' is replaced by 'aisle,' and this suggests the advisability of considering the word 'porticus' in its various meanings.¹ The excavations it is true have shown that the spaces in question resembled in plan the aisles of a basilican church, but were separated from the nave not by colonnades or arches upon piers but by walls pierced here and there by doorways, and clearly were not parts of the church in the sense in which we should apply the description to aisles. Bede draws a clear

¹ Note on the word *Porticus*. The meaning of this was vigorously discussed by Sir J. H. Parker and others in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1862, and as the subject is often on the tapis a few sentences on it may be useful. For the derivation of the word, the 'nomen a *porta*, ut videtur, factum' of Forcellini must suffice. It would thus mean primarily not the door itself but the architectural setting of it, but that in early mediaeval times it meant other things also is shown by the addition of a qualifying word, '*porticus ingressus*,' when it has the original sense of portal. Extension of the meaning of the word seems to have been brought about by the accidental fact that in classical lands, from the old Minoan period onwards, the architectural setting of a door involved the use of columns. The two columns of the Cretan vestibules were multiplied into a row before the entrance alike of the Greek and Italian temple and the Early Christian basilica. Forthwith the word acquired the connotation of a row of columns independent of a doorway, and '*porticus*' becomes equivalent in its use to our familiar derivation from it '*portico*.' In this sense it became the equivalent in mediaeval Latin of 'aisle' and is synonymous with '*ala*.' When Dunstan wished to widen a certain older church he is said to have added '*alas vel porticus*' (*Memorials of St Dunstan*, Rolls Series, no. 63, p. 271). This extension of meaning is of course conditioned by the fact—again accidental—that in Early Christian churches in Mediterranean lands the aisle was separated from the nave by a row of columns and was backed by a wall, resembling therein a normal '*portico*.' There seems a tendency at present to revive a view that was held by Professor Willis and to make 'aisle' the common or indeed the only meaning in mediaeval Latin of '*porticus*.' This is very far however from being the case. Probably because the aisle of a church is a side space

distinction in his bk. ii ch. 3 between the funereal porticus and the 'ipsa ecclesia,' whereas an aisle would be part of the ipsa ecclesia. This fact gives the church a special character and interest. It was evidently a church of a kind represented at Rome in connection with the suburban cemeteries, and used for burials in the days after Constantine when the custom of underground interment was passing away. Dom H. Leclercq in his *Manuel d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, Paris, 1907, I, 307, note, remarks that the original oratories in the cemeteries, designed for the cult of the martyrs who reposed below, after the time of Constantine grew into basilicas but always preserved their funereal character; 'they did not in general,' he says, 'serve for the celebration of the sacred liturgy.' This may have been the case at St Augustine, and certainly the funereal character of this church was always prominent, and is brought opening out of the main area, 'porticus' received the sense of any distinct space flanking or radiating from such a main area. In a passage quoted (p. 269) the three arms of a cruciform church opening N, E and S from the crossing are called 'porticus,' and Ducange, sub voce, quotes a mediaeval writer who uses the word for the sanctuary or altar end of the church as a whole. Effmann (*Die Karol. Otton. Bauten zu Werden*, p. 39) says that 'porticus' is also used for the concentric aisle round a central circle or octagon, as at S. Vitale, or Aachen. 'Porticus' may therefore have the legitimate meanings (1) of anything in the shape of a vestibule, (2) of any colonnade, either as an independent structure or as part of a church, and (3) of any non-columnar side space or adjunct opening from the main body of a building but not actually a vestibule. There is an instructive passage in Cap. 6 of the resolutions of the Council of Nantes given in Mansi, xviii A, 167, which runs 'prohibendum etiam secundum majorum instituta ut in ecclesia nullatenus sepeliantur, sed in atrio, aut in porticu, aut in exhedris ecclesiae.' Here of course the 'atrium' is the fore-court, and 'porticus' the vestibule, both used, see (p. 330), for burials, while 'exedra' stands for any side space opening into the main area, as a recess with seats may open on a thoroughfare. Now the word 'exedra' is not in use (save perhaps exceptionally) for a part of the mediaeval church, and the word 'porticus' in the sense last given takes its place. Hence William Thorn employs the word for the little side adjunct at St Pancras (p. 86), and also following the example of Bede for the place of rest of Augustine and his successors. The English word 'chapel' is better for this than 'aisle,' which would convey the impression that the church was a basilica, while this was not the case.



into full relief on the occasion of the Homeric battle over the bodies of ecclesiastical chieftains fought out between St Augustine and Christ Church in VIII, for which see the Rolls Series publication of the St Augustine documents. We see that Canterbury under Æthelbert preserved the Roman taboo against burial within the city walls, and the suburban site at St Augustine's was chosen for the royal as well as the episcopal mausoleum. An important part of the building, the eastern portion of what might have been, but were not side aisles, was entirely given up to burials, with which the N space soon became overcrowded. The dedication of each quasi-aisle to a saint whose altar was placed within it is something to remark and represents an early stage in that multiplication of subsidiary altars in a church which was soon carried very far in England, and which will be discussed in the next chapter in connection with Northumbrian monuments of the latter part of the century. Altars were also placed at the heads of some of the episcopal and saintly tombs.

The investigations are not, as we have seen, completed, and the interpretation and amplification of what has actually been laid bare is necessarily still to some extent conjectural. A general plan of all the early work exposed was made in the summer of 1923 by Mr C. R. Peers, C.B.E., and an able coadjutor, and this by the kindness of the authorities of St Augustine's College and the consent of Mr Peers is here reproduced as Fig. 44. The most interesting portion of what is indicated here is the upper corner upon the northern side, where the 'porticus' of St Gregory was brought to light in 1913, when some of the episcopal tombs therein were uncovered and identified from the descriptions in Gocelin's tract on the Translation of St Augustine. A full account with illustrations and translations of pertinent passages from Gocelin is contained in a paper by Sir W. St John Hope communicated to the Society of Antiquaries in June, 1915, and published in *Archaeologia*, LXVI, whereto the reader is referred for the

somewhat complicated details for which there is here no space. The original position of the episcopal tombs with the names of their occupants can be seen in the plan, Fig. 44, but all that remain now visible are the emplacements of the tombs of Laurentius, Mellitus, and Justus, with that N of Laurentius where reposed the famous Abbot Adrian, the founder of the school of Canterbury as a centre of learning. The other tombs further to N are now covered by the line of the N wall of the N aisle of Abbot Scotland's great Norman church, while no monumental remains of the tombs in the S or Martin's porticus have been brought to light. The excavations here were delayed till quite recently by the existence on the site of offices belonging to the adjacent hospital, that still barred operations at the date of Sir W. Hope's paper.

Of the visible tombs themselves, now protected by a roof, it will be understood at once that no bodies were found in them for these had been translated in 1091 under conditions described by Gocelin. Whether any traces of them will be found if and when their location in Norman and later times can be discovered it is impossible to say, but it is important to note that the mode of the original burial of which the surviving tombs preserve evidence shows very clearly that the sacred bodies were so disposed that no thought of their ever being moved or even seen again can have entered people's minds. The corpse was enclosed in a wooden coffin which may have contained within it one of lead. A sinking was made in the floor of the quasi-aisle or chapel larger than the coffin which was then placed within it. Cement or plaster in a liquid state was then poured in filling up the extra space and rising above the coffin lid, a mass of concrete being added above to a height in the case of the tomb of Laurentius of about 3 ft., in that of Mellitus of only 3 in. There is no sign now of any external adornment of the sepulchres, but being in some cases very distinctly in evidence we must assume that they presented a seemingly appearance like the sarcophagi in early Italian basilicas.

When the translation was in progress the bodies in their coffins were laboriously cut out of the receptacles by hewing away the cement along one side,¹ and it is possible now to see into some of the empty cavities. This decent disposal in perpetuity of the mortal remains of these titular saints is in striking contrast with the procedure of later times when such relics were not only 'translated' but sniffed at, inspected, bedizened, dismembered, purloined, and treated generally in ways that offend the modern sense of what is reverent and decent in dealing with the dead. In connection with Hexham, at a period nearly a century later than these early interments, there will be an opportunity of further notice of these characteristic but often revolting mediaeval practices (p. 183 f.).

In concluding this notice of the early Augustinian funereal church, the plan, Fig. 44, may have a word of explanation. There are indicated on it not only the existing and conjectural elements of the original church of Æthelbert but the extensions of the time of Dunstan in the latter part of X. This affected the breadth by the enlargement northwards of the N porticus to contain further burials, as is seen in the plan, and also the length of the church by extensive westward additions, exhibited more or less conjecturally in Fig. 44. The W end of the early church comes, so far as can be seen, to the line on the plan between the 'first narthex' and 'second narthex,' and W of that appear to begin the extensions of the time of Dunstan. Here on the line of walling from N to S, partly shaded, between 'second narthex' and 'vestibule,' have come to light some huge squared Roman stones that formed the lowest courses of the W wall. Fig. 45 (certain temporary structures being omitted) gives a slight sketch of them as seen in July, 1923. That recumbent on the spectator's right but cracked across is a massive pillar like the shaft of a big Northumbrian

¹ Where the original inner face of the cement has been preserved it has retained the exact impress of the wooden coffin round which it had been poured.

cross,¹ the others are of the pillar-like or cubical form we have met with already at St Mildred's, Canterbury, Fig. 5. To the left, above these and their superincumbent débris, is the great sleeper wall of Scotland's arcade with the massifs of three of his pillars upon it, while the modern roof that covers the original N porticus with its tombs is just seen above these. At the extreme W end of the whole complex Fig. 44 shows the ground plan of the tower which must belong to the exten-



FIG. 45, Sketch at St Augustine excavations,
July, 1923.

sion of X. This merits special attention because within the walls of it are to be seen a number of graves excavated in the rock, shaped to the contour of the body, with at least in one case a child's grave hollowed in the floor of the receptacle for an adult.

An answer has already been indicated to the question whether or not St Peter and St Paul should be regarded as a basilican church with nave and side aisles, or a single-nave

¹ This has now, June, 1924, been taken out, and is found to have been part of a monument. There is a sinking on the top to receive a head piece. It is cut from one of the sandstone blocks of the tertiary age found upon the Kentish downs as survivals of denudation.

church like St Pancras flanked with side chapels or adjuncts used for purposes of sepulture and described by the word 'porticus.' The note on the meanings of this Latin word in mediaeval literature will be of service later on in connection with Wilfrid's famous church at Hexham, and here it can usefully be repeated that it may mean 'aisle' or 'side chapel,' but that the latter seems a more appropriate meaning here, as the side spaces at St Augustine cannot have formed part of the church used for congregational purposes. Hence the building was not really a basilica, but had a special character indicated in the quotation from Leclercq (p. 90).

(V) The example at Rochester, evidence for which was discovered under the present cathedral, was fully discussed and illustrated by the Rev. Canon Grevile Livett and Sir William St John Hope in *Archaeologia Cantiana*, xviii and xxiii, and the accounts make it clear that the remains represent a Saxon church of repute which may very well have been the first bishop's church on the site, dating from the year 604 A.D., see plan, Fig. 46. The nave of this church which was aisleless appears to have measured 42 ft. by 28 ft. 6 in., and the apse had a diameter of 24 ft. 6 in. by a depth of 19 ft., exhibiting thus the form of a half ellipse rather than the more normal semicircle.¹

(VI) The old church at Lyminge near Shorncliffe (Vol. 1, 279), the foundations of which are to be seen immediately to S of the present parish church of Early Norman origin, agrees in its plan with Rochester and measured 32 ft. by 17 ft. 3 in. in the nave with an apse, here semicircular, 14 ft. 6 in. in diameter. These two churches, like St Pancras, are aisleless, whereas at (VII) Reculver we again meet with a plan of the

¹ There is some evidence that there was a second apse (so Hope, *Arch. Cant.*, xxiii, 212, note), or a chapel of some kind perhaps like the outbuildings at St Pancras, for Bede, v, 23, tells us that in 726 Bishop Tobias, a notable scholar, was buried 'in porticu sancti Pauli apostoli, quem intra ecclesiam sancti Andreae sibi ipse in locum sepulchri fecerat.'

complete basilican form. The ruined church called by this name stands on the shore of the Thames estuary between Margate and Herne Bay, within the enclosure of the Roman fort of Regulbium, now much eroded by the sea, and is conspicuous from afar for its twin W towers and spires called locally in blundering fashion 'The Reculvers.' Most of the existing work is of the early Gothic period but there remain some important fragments of the original Saxon church built about 670 by one Bassa a 'mass priest' to whom the site had




FIG. 46, Plan of Early Saxon church at Rochester, reproduced by permission from *Archaeologia Cantiana*.

been granted by Ecgbert the then king of Kent.¹ It was a pillar basilica about 75 ft. in interior length, terminating with a semicircular apse 24 ft. in width. It is noteworthy that the original concrete pavement is said to remain below ground over almost the whole of the interior, and this is faced with fine plaster made with red pounded tile and brought up to a polished surface.² The same sort of material, obviously a survival of Roman 'opus signinum' technique (p. 57), covers, it will be remembered, part of the walls of the nave of

¹ *A.S. Chronicle*, ad ann. 669; cf. Bede, *Hist. Eccl.*, v, 8.

² *Archaeologia Cantiana*, xii, 248.

St Martin, Canterbury. The chief interest of the church is the treatment of the feature which in the basilicas of the Romanized West generally is called the arch of triumph. This is the archway which gives access to the apse, and is normally a single span the full width of the apse, the semi-dome of which abuts against it. Here however in place of a single arch spanning the nave at its E limit where the presbytery begins, there was an arcade of three arches that was brought forward a few feet into the nave so as to screen off a space before the apse. The three arches rested in the middle on two detached columns that are among the most interesting and at the same time puzzling monuments that have come down to us from Saxon times. The plan, Fig. 47, gives this part of the building. The Saxon work¹ is shown in black and the dotted lines extending eastward beyond the apse indicate the Early English chancel of considerable length that was substituted for the apse in later mediaeval times. The screen of three arches was allowed to stand while the apse itself was removed, and remained till the ruthless destruction of the church in the early years of the nineteenth century.² The columns which divided the openings, after some migrations, were recovered through the agency of the antiquary Dr Sheppard of Canterbury and now stand in the garden to N of the N transept of Canterbury Cathedral. A generation ago they were accepted as Roman work, and on the strength of this assumption Reculver, like some other Saxon churches such as Brixworth, was supposed to be in part a Roman secular building turned at a later date to Christian purposes. This theory, for which there is no evidence or probability, is not called for because there is no reason why Roman columns should not be used in a church of

¹ Identified as such by Mr George Dowker, and published by him in *Arch. Cant.*, loc. cit. Much of the walling now seen above ground on the site is later than Saxon times.

² Mr Romilly Allen in his *Monumental History of the British Church*, Lond., 1889, p. 13 f., gives an account of the church and of its fate.

Saxon or even later date (p. 58). The Roman origin of the columns has however been contested, and a great authority on Roman architectural remains, Mr G. E. Fox, brought forward forcible arguments against a Roman ascription.¹

Mr Fox thought the columns were probably Saxon imitations of Roman work. They are more than 16 ft. high, and




Fig. 47, Plan of Saxon work at E end of Reculver Church, Kent. From plan by George Dowker, F.G.S.

the shaft is everywhere within an inch of 7 ft. in circumference. The absence of tapering and entasis is of course abnormal in Roman shafts of this size and careful finish, though the ruder monoliths already referred to in some churches of the North and Midlands (p. 58) appear to be devoid of those refinements. It is true that no Roman parallel can be quoted to

¹ In a letter to *The Builder* of Oct. 20, 1900, and in *The Archaeological Journal*, LIII, 355.

the form of the caps and bases, and that they both look barbarous beside the attic base of the Roman shaft to be seen at St Pancras, Canterbury, in a position corresponding to that once occupied by these columns at Reculver. If we assume however that the capitals were intended ultimately to receive enrichments in gilded bronze, there is nothing unclassical about them¹ or about the bases, which after all are not so utterly unlike in profile to some forms of the Grecian Ionic base. It is moreover just as hard to find for the columns Saxon as Roman affinities, and till something resembling them is found elsewhere, it may be best to reserve the question of their origin as still unsettled. The writer takes the Roman view, and this is also held by Rivoira² who holds however that the caps are barbarously re-cut by the Saxons. The undercutting of the lowest member of the neck moulding should in this connection not be overlooked, as the only Saxon parallel known to the writer is a moulding on the S door of the tower at Barton-on-Humber. For the columns see Fig. 174.

Apart from the interest of the columns themselves the method of their use needs to be briefly discussed. Reculver is only the most conspicuous instance of an arrangement met with in several buildings of the time. At St Pancras there was an arcade of columns similarly designed though before the completion of the edifice the two lateral openings seem to have been built up. An arcade of the same kind is conjecturally assigned to the Augustinian church in the plan in Fig. 44 and the existence of a sleeper wall across the chord of the apse at Rochester gives good evidence for it here also. St Peter-on-the-Wall, Essex, and Brixworth supply, as we will presently see, other examples, in which however the arches are supported on piers and not on columns. The suggestion has

¹ The general form of the cap, square above and gradually cut down and rounded off to the circular top of the shaft may be paralleled by some late Roman caps in the Hunterian Museum, Glasgow, from Barr Hill.

² *Lombardic Architecture*, II, 151.

been offered¹ that this substitution of a series of smaller openings for one large one may be in part due to Anglo-Saxon inability or diffidence in face of the problem of constructing arches of any considerable span (p. 69). The use of an arcade made it possible to lay out apses of formidable breadth—in the cases of Rochester and Reculver 24 ft., in that of St Pancras 25 ft.—which would have necessitated on the ordinary Roman 'arch of triumph' scheme construction of a rather exacting kind. These apses were moreover of extra depth as well as width as additional space was secured in them, at St Pancras by 'stilting,' at Rochester by substituting for the semicircle a half ellipse, at Reculver by cutting off from the nave a certain portion and throwing it into the apse. At Brixworth we shall see this same process carried still further. The object is of course to increase the presbyterial domain separated by the arcade from the nave. This additional accommodation for the clergy over and above that furnished by the semicircular apse was provided in Early Christian churches generally by arrangements of different kinds. In the greater churches of the city Rome, such as St Peter and St Paul-without-the-Walls, a spacious transept interposed between the nave and aisles and the apse gave the clergy room to develop ecclesiastical pageantry. The stilting of the apse occurs with some frequency in Early Christian churches outside Italy, as in N Africa and Syria, and screens formed of arcading are used to cut off spaces at the altar ends of interiors in not a few early churches especially in Spain.² A near parallel to what we shall find at Brixworth appears in the instructive Carolingian basilica at Michelstadt (Steinbach) in the Odenwald built by Eginhard about 825 A.D. In 1900 when the writer saw it the interior of the then desecrated

¹ The suggestion was made by Mr Micklethwaite in the article already referred to so often in *Archaeological Journal*, LIII, p. 299.

² Dehio u. von Bezold, *Kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes*, I, 98, enumerate some examples.

building preserved clear traces of a cross wall about 12 ft. high, which, with openings in the centre, formed a screen that cut off a space of about 16 ft. from the E end of the nave.¹ A IX church in W France, St G  n  roux, Poitou, is another example. Michelstadt, like Brixworth and like most of the Early Saxon churches we have been considering, was monastic,² but all these churches were at the same time missionary churches to which the surrounding population had to be conducted or allured. The part of the interior screened off by these arcades at the altar end would serve as the monks' church, the general congregation occupying the nave.

Almost all the churches that have been noticed are marked by a columned arcade cutting off the space in question.

(VIII) Another example in which piers are used in the same connection is to be found in Essex, where there is a chapel near Bradwell-on-Sea known as St Peter-on-the-Wall, from the fact that it is actually built over the wall, and probably even across the threshold of the principal gateway, of the Roman fortress of Othona (see the map of Roman Britain Vol. 1, Fig. 5, p. 52). This was called in Bede's time Ythan-caestir, and here, as the historian tells us, Cedd, the apostle of the East Saxons, about 653 A.D., built for himself a mission station.³ There is now to be seen on the site a structure, for a long time desecrated and used as a barn, but now, from 1920, repaired, reconsecrated, and restored to religious use, that is claimed to be the very fabric reared by Cedd. Though quoins of pillar-like Roman stones are a new feature, it has many of the characteristics of an Early Saxon church of the type we have now come to know from St Pancras and similar examples. This type is however distinctly Kentish, and in its use of the apse Roman, so that it is not easy to accept it off-hand as the work of the Celtic missionary monk from the North.

¹ Adamy, *Die Einhard-Basilika zu Steinbach im Odenwalde*, Hannover, 1885.

² Adamy, l.c., p. 6.

³ Vol. 1, pp. 172 and 201. See also *Archaeologia*, xli, 421 f.

Moreover the custom in the time of Cedd was to place churches and mission stations within the protecting lines of Roman forts, a course adopted by Fursa in East Anglia (Vol. 1, p. 201), and not to level the walls of these and build on the top of them, as has been done at St Peter-on-the-Wall. It may conceivably represent a rebuilding under Kentish direction of a simpler oratory perhaps of wood that had been reared by Cedd. This question of actual provenance however is from the architectural point of view comparatively unimportant. Whoever built it and whatever was the actual date of its erection, there can be no question of its early character, nor of the justice of the claim made for it that it belongs to the group of VII churches with which we are here concerned.

The writer's personal knowledge of the building dates from the time when it was used as a barn, and when a shed was built up against it at the E end of the S side. This has now been cleared away and there has in consequence come to light evidence of a doorway apparently leading to a S 'porticus' or side chapel, a similar one being conjectured on N. Now that the whole building has been freed and examined, a complete ground plan has recently been published in the IVth Volume of the Report of the English Monument Commission on Essex, but it unfortunately cannot be reproduced here for a reason given in the Preface.

The plan shows an oblong cella laid out with far more accuracy than is generally the case with Saxon work and measuring internally 49 ft. 8 in. by 21 ft. 8 in. This was terminated to E by a semicircular apse now destroyed. The walls 24 ft. high and about 2 ft. 6 in. in thickness are chiefly composed of Roman materials, both brick and stone, and exhibit the uncommon feature of buttresses, of which four strengthen the two W quoins and others abut the N and S walls. One on the S side is well preserved and is 2 ft. on the face with a projection of 1 ft. 10 in. At a height of some 12 ft. they end with sloping heads. These buttresses are in part at any rate in

bond with the wall, as can be seen, e.g., in the fragment of the easternmost one on the S side. In one place a large stone is partly in the wall and partly in a buttress and is cut to the angle formed by the two faces. The drawing Fig. 48, from a photograph taken by the writer some years ago, gives an idea of the nature of the walling and of the fashion of the




FIG. 48, Part of S wall of St Peter, Bradwell, Essex.

buttresses, which it will be seen flank the corner but allow the actual quoin composed of large Roman pillar stones to appear. This is the SW quoin, and turning the corner to W we find a W door in front of which there must have been originally a porch. Above is the best preserved window of five which, though considerably battered, have left their traces, two in each of the long walls and one high up in the W gable. They are internally splayed from an aperture of about 3 ft. in

width to an inner spread of about 5 ft. The jambs of four of the windows are preserved, and that on W has a round head turned in workmanlike fashion in Roman bricks. The heads of the three that are open are flat, and Mr C. R. Peers, who directed the work on the chapel, convinced himself by personal examination that these flat heads were in the original design.

In place of the single 'arch of triumph' opening towards the apse there was a set of smaller arches, the northernmost of which is preserved for a space covered by twenty-two of the Roman bricks of which it is composed. The arch is set back two or three inches on its jamb. The number of these subsidiary arches should be three, but the curve of the N arch makes it very doubtful whether there would be room for these. Two arches with a pier in the centre would have an awkward effect, but Saxon architecture shows anomalies equally surprising.

On the E side of this arcade the line of the nave wall is extended on N for about 4 in. where, in the lower part, it ends with a smooth face that seems to indicate a doorway. Mr Lewin stated¹ that there was here on N a sacristy or vestry of which the foundations were found by excavation. On S the corresponding wall runs in a straight line for 4 ft. or so, so that the curve of the apse did not begin, as is also the case at Deerhurst (p. 218), for some little distance beyond the arcade. Notice has just been taken of this 'stilting' of an apse, for so it may be termed, in other buildings at home and abroad where spaces are partitioned off.

In connection with this question of the subdivision of the interior of these monastic mission-churches it will be convenient to take next in order (IX) Brixworth, in Northants, situated at some distance from Kent, or the Kentish side of Essex, where we have hitherto found our examples.

¹ *Archaeologia*, xli, 448.

A Peterborough writer¹ informs us that the monks of Medeshamstede, as the place was then called, about the year 680 established a monastic colony at Bricklesworthe now Brixworth a few miles N of Northampton. Sir Henry Howorth in his *Golden Days of the Early English Church*,² II, 187, suggests that the architectural inspiration of the remarkable building we have now to consider came from Wilfrid, who in the course of his very active, even peripatetic, career was a good deal in Mercia. His biographer, Eddius,³ tells us that while he was living in retirement at Ripon, 666-669, Wulfere of Mercia invited him to exercise episcopal functions in that realm, while later on when he was exiled from Northumbria we find him more than once in Mercia exercising functions of the kind, and he acts as bishop of the Middle English in the capacity of informal successor to Sexwulf, who had been Abbot of Medeshamstede at the time Brixworth was founded.⁴ This point has an importance that will emerge when we come to consider Wilfrid's own achievement at Hexham. Brixworth, in great part at any rate, remains to us though Hexham has disappeared. Now Brixworth is beyond all comparison the most remarkable extant monument of the period, and considering that it was merely the church of a subsidiary settlement in a country village it appears abnormally large and imposing. It is of course a familiar fact that at this day all over the country we meet with village churches that seem in size and grandeur out of all natural proportion with their simple surroundings, but these churches have been added to and elaborated from age to age. The pre-Conquest church was as a rule an unpretentious monument, and it is a significant fact that taking all existing Saxon churches, apart from those

¹ Hugh White (Hugo Candidus) in Sparke's *Historiae Anglicae Script. Var.*, II, 8.

² London, John Murray, 1917.

³ *Historians of the Church of York*, Rolls Series, no. 71/1, c. 14.


⁴ Plummer's Bede, II, 317 f.

we only know from literary records, there are only five that can be proved to have possessed side aisles,¹ and this fact gives the general standard of the buildings. Brixworth far exceeds this normal standard, and when it was complete gave an interior 100 ft. long by a total width, so far as the side aisles extended, of nearly 60. If Brixworth had perished and we only knew of it from contemporary chroniclers we should be very much inclined to assume exaggeration in their accounts. 'If it were anything like what is described,' we should say, 'it would have created a precedent and the architecture of the whole succeeding period would have felt its influence.' Given its conditions and surroundings and the whole after character of Saxon architecture, we should argue that it must have been smaller and simpler than is represented in the records.

In the case of Hexham we have practically no monumental evidence, but there are contemporary and later accounts of it that give the impression of something rather grand and elaborate. These accounts are held by some excellent critics to be little better than a tissue of exaggerations in no wise to be taken seriously. But Hexham may in its own kind have been as remarkable as on a lower scale was Brixworth, and the fact that it seems to have stood outside the general course of development of Saxon architecture may be explained by Wilfrid's lordly and ambitious spirit and the considerable means he lavished on his monumental undertakings. The idea that this spirit expressed itself also at Brixworth, though it is only a conjecture, is one not lightly to be set aside.

In dealing with Brixworth one is met by the difficulty that like most mediaeval edifices it represents more than one architectural period. From the historical point of view this is embarrassing, for if at each period of our survey we only deal with those parts of a building which belong to that particular period the monument is, as it were, dismembered and we do

¹ Reculver, Brixworth, Lydd, and Wing. Great Paxton, Hunts., can fairly now be counted in. See (p. 368).






FIG. 49. Brixworth Church, from the south-west.

not get the impression of it as a whole. On the other hand if we treat it from the first as a whole it is necessary to describe and comment on, in a premature fashion, later features at the consideration of which we have not yet arrived in our chronological survey.

The general appearance of Brixworth church as seen from NW can be judged from the view Fig. 49, while in Fig. 50 is given the plan. It is a large somewhat gaunt structure, the plain square rudely constructed fabric of which is crowned by an elegant spire of XIV. The use of Roman materials is evident at a glance. Almost all the openings are turned in Roman bricks, which are also employed here and there in the rubble walling especially at the corners. A little observation will show that they were certainly not placed by Roman hands. Generally speaking in the larger arches there are two rows of voussoirs, one outside the other, separated by flat courses of bricks concentric with the curve of the arch. In the two rows of voussoirs the bricks are set edgeways, and should all point towards the centre from which the curve of the arch is struck. Since the bricks are even, the mortar joints should be wedge-shaped to secure the form of the arch. Here at Brixworth however the principle of the radiating joint in arch construction was evidently not understood by the builder, and an illustration already given, Fig. 36, shows the curiously naïve manner in which he started at times to turn his arches. There was a Roman settlement of some kind at Brixworth as numerous finds have attested, and from Roman buildings these bricks must have come. It has been claimed for the structure itself that it is a Roman survival, but independently of the conclusive technical evidence just adduced it is in form and character an Early Christian basilica and there is nothing about Brixworth, any more than there is about Reculver (p. 97), that suggests a building turned from a secular to a sacred purpose.

The elements of the structure consist in a square W tower with a half-round stair turret projecting from its W face, a

nave, a prolongation of the nave by a presbyterial space, and beyond this to E, not seen in the drawing, an externally polygonal apse. Along the side of the nave on the ground story will be noticed a series of large arched recesses in each of which there appears a window. These are in reality the original openings which gave access from the nave to a N aisle. This N aisle, to which corresponded one on S, must be restored in thought with its sloping lean-to roof abutting on the wall of the nave on a line marked by the sloping set-off in the wall under the upper row of r. h. windows. These last are the windows of the original clearstory, and are of a type uncommon in this country. They resemble the windows of the Early Christian basilicas of Rome and Ravenna in their openness and ample dimensions. The aperture is wider in the interior than it is outside, but the splay is nothing approaching to that which is seen in the ordinary internally splayed lights of Late Saxon and of Norman times, while the actual width of the external aperture, which measures about 3 ft. in the clear, is much greater than we generally find in our Saxon buildings.¹ In comparison with the normal widely splayed openings they present the appearance of being cut straight through the wall as is the fashion of the classical aperture. Strictly speaking they are not so formed, but exhibit, like all the windows we have been dealing with, the mediaeval feature of the splay. The stair turret is lighted by small square headed openings, into the outer aperture of which were fitted stone slabs pierced with narrow loops. The suggestion has been made that these were loopholes for archers defending the church against attack. They do not however command the accesses to the building, and would have been almost useless for such a purpose. The plan of one opening is given in Fig. 53.

The tower is one of the features of the church which belong to a much later period than that of its first building,

¹ The windows at St Peter-on-the-Wall are similar, though some appear to have had flat heads (p. 104).

but it has to be noticed here for the sake of completeness. It is one of a limited class of Saxon towers that were built up on the walls of earlier structures in the form of a porch, or as at Christ Church, Canterbury (p. 79), a side chapel. The tower, or rather the earlier substructure of it, possessed doorways or at any rate arched openings on all its four faces. A detail not to be passed over can be seen at the bottom of the NW corner of the tower—that nearest the eye in the view—and also at the corresponding SW quoin.

Here the attachment of walls thinner than those of the tower running in the directions N and S can be plainly seen, the lowest courses being in bond with the porch. These indications of buildings now destroyed at the W end of the church are important and must be taken in connection with similar marks seen elsewhere. Thus in the case of the two very early porch-towers at Monkwearmouth and Corbridge there are signs of similar structures, and these are more apparent still on the very late W tower at Netheravon in Wiltshire. The significance of these indications is a matter for further inquiry. It will be noticed in the view that the original nave arcade and the clearstory windows stop short before the E end of the nave is reached. The walls of the side aisles, the foundations of which have been laid bare, also stopped at the same point, and these are the external signs of a peculiar feature of the interior plan which will presently receive attention.

The church is entered through a round headed doorway at the W extremity of the S wall of the nave that is inserted into one of the old arcade openings to the side aisle. The interior view of the church looking E reveals a temple of imposing length and, even with the side aisles gone, of ample width. The space is however not unbroken, for at a distance of about 60 ft. from the W end there is a cross wall now broken by a single wide pointed arch dating about the year 1400. Originally, as was proved by excavations in 1841,

there was here an arcade of three arches supported by two intermediate piers and by the piers which still exist as projections from the N and S walls. This screen cut off a space of, roughly speaking, 30 ft. square before the arch leading into the apse. In the N wall, just on the E side of the projecting pier, there is a narrow doorway 3 ft. wide, now blocked, and this would have led either into the open, or into some sacristy or similar building at the E end of the N aisle which stopped at the level of the projecting piers. What there was in this part on S cannot be known as there is here a later mediaeval S chapel, and this, with the exception of the roof, the upper part of the tower, and the spire, is almost the only portion of the structure that is not original, or at any rate restored, Saxon work. Passing on still eastwards we come to the apsidal presbytery in connection with which there is more than one point of interest.¹ The arch of triumph, to use basilican terminology, is 9 ft. 8 in. wide with a height of nearly 22 ft. above the floor in front of it, and gives access to a chancel with an apse bounded internally by a semicircle but on the exterior by five sides of a polygon. A straight piece of wall before the semicircle and the polygon begin gives additional depth to the presbytery which measures 19 ft. 2 in. from W to E by a width of 18 ft. At the external angles of the polygon there are buttresses 18 in. wide with a projection of 6 in. that are neatly cut to the form required. Of the actual walling of the apse only a portion on NW is original the rest being a restoration. A buttress occurs however in the original work, and included in this also there was a r. h. window, now blocked and invisible, the situation of which is seen on the plan. There is no sign that the apse ever was vaulted. The present roof is of plaster.

¹ There is a valuable paper 'On the Chancel of Brixworth Church' by Sir Henry Dryden, in *Ass. Soc. Reports*, 1890, from which some of the measurements and details given in the text and in Fig. 51 have been derived. The paper notices previous publications on the church.

Returning to W of the arch of triumph we notice on either side of it a r. h. internally splayed window, and beneath these on each side a very low blocked doorway. On the exterior it is seen that these doorways once opened on, or rather *in* a flight of steps, for these must have begun within the church, that led down to an ambulatory or passage round the outside of the apse the level of which is about 6 ft. below the floor of




FIG. 51, Sections at eastern end of Brixworth.

the church. As can be seen on N this passage was originally vaulted over and formed below ground a covered way round the apse that corresponded with the semicircular passages round, but as a rule *within*, the circuit of apses in Early Christian churches on the Continent. Such passages generally give access to a small chamber called a 'confessio'¹ excavated under the floor of the apse for the reception of a sarcophagus or relics, but investigations have not revealed the presence at

¹ From 'confessor,' as the place where the remains of such a holy personage were bestowed. The word has nothing to do with the modern 'confessional.'

Brixworth of any chamber of the kind. On the other hand in the exterior wall of this ambulatory which is partly original there are two arched recesses that seem intended for tombs, and correspond to the 'arcosolia' of the Roman catacombs. Similar recesses occur in connection with the crypts at Repton (p. 313) and Wing (p. 322). The arrangement of the presbytery and ambulatory, with the different levels, can be seen in the outline sections in Fig. 51, where A shows a section in




FIG. 52, Interior view of Brixworth, looking west.

front of the arch into the chancel, and B a section through the N wall of the chancel and the ambulatory. The springing of the vault over the latter is clearly visible on the existing wall.

Turning now our steps westwards we are confronted by the W tower and by certain problems which connect themselves therewith. The view Fig. 52 (in which the modern pews and other fittings are ignored) shows the thoroughly basilican aspect of the interior, in which we must imagine the arches of the ground story opening into side aisles. The W

end must now engage our attention. We see there on the ground story a doorway of entrance of a moderate size less than 5 ft. in width, but in the wall above it there are the marks of the springing of another arch apparently of about the same span the crown of which, as seen on the W face of the wall, rose to about 20 ft. above the floor. It will be remembered that traces of a blocked opening of much the same kind and position and of considerable width have come to light in the W wall of the nave of St Martin, Canterbury (p. 82). See also (p. 471). It is conceivable that we have to deal in each case with a single very lofty arch of entrance. The arch of the present W doorway at Brixworth presents however no signs of having been inserted.

Higher up than the indications of this blocked archway comes a triple opening the arches of which are divided by baluster shafts of a kind we shall meet with elsewhere in the later Saxon period. This opening cannot have coexisted with the archway just below and must be of a comparatively later date, which is also indicated by the form of the baluster shafts. The appearance of these shafts is a sign that additions have been made in Saxon times to the main fabric, and we are led to remind ourselves of the probable history of the church. Founded about 680 as the church of a monastic settlement, but at the same time no doubt a parish church, and indeed from its size and situation a sort of mother church for the whole district, it was partially destroyed and rendered for a time useless by the heathen Danes.

At a later period, probably near the days of revival in X under king Edgar, the fabric was restored to use but only as a parish church, and with the sacrifice of the side aisles, without which the building was of ample size for its purpose. To this epoch will belong the W opening with the baluster shafts.

How much, we may ask, was done at this time? It is natural to think that the whole tower, or at any rate the middle

part of it, may be of the same date as the triple opening. Let us study this question in the tower itself.

Entering this we note on the ground story the four openings on the four sides of the square. Of these the W one is now a mere doorway 3 ft. 6 in. wide, situated to the S of the middle of the wall and giving access to the turret staircase, but marks in the wall show that it was originally a wide and lofty archway central in the wall, 6 ft. 8 in. in span with a height of 12 ft. 5 in.—a monumental outer portal to the imposing interior. It is quite clear therefore that just as the triple opening is later than the original W wall, so the stair turret is posterior in date to the ground story of the tower. What was the arrangement of this ground story before the turret was built? This question connects itself with that of the purpose of the subsidiary structures which were attached as we have seen to the W corners of the tower, and must not be entered on here, but the hypothesis cannot be put aside that the lower part of the tower was originally a porch with a wide W doorway, and that the walls were carried up later in a tower form. The ground story of the tower, at any rate, with its W arch and with the now blocked archway in the W wall of the church noticed above, appears contemporary with the rest of the fabric. An examination of the lower part of the W wall of the nave, in connection with the parts of the tower that are on the same level, exhibits such marked similarity in material and technique that all these parts must be of the same epoch. It is clear that the lowest story of the tower was a W adjunct of some kind. The date 680 is too early for us to think of a W tower, but this feature would agree very well with the time of restoration, when we must suppose the walls of the W adjunct or porch carried up in the form of a tower, and the triple opening cut in the W wall of the church.

The most natural explanation of the stair turret would be that it was made to provide easy access to the chamber in which was the triple opening, and we must accordingly assume

it to be contemporary with the tower, that is, with the middle section of the tower, though it has often been placed at a later date. One thing is clear, the doorway, about 3 ft. wide, that now gives access from the turret to the chamber with the triple opening must have been made in connection with the stair, for like the similar doorway on the ground story it is not in the middle of the wall, while, as the plan of this stage of the tower, Fig. 53, will show, the tower and turret seem very much of a piece at any rate in this part. It is much to be deplored that the original belfry openings have not been preserved in the upper stages of the tower, as the details here might have helped in adjusting the question of relative dates.




FIG. 53. Brixworth Tower at level of triple opening.

One valuable criterion of date was pointed out by Mr Hamilton Thompson in the *Archaeological Journal*, Vol. LXIX, where he called attention to the use of tufa¹ in the upper stages of the stair turret and tower. Calcareous tufa which had been used freely by the Romans was much favoured as a building material by the Normans, and its employment here makes it likely that the upper parts here spoken of were a Norman contribution to the edifice. Tufa is not found in the lower parts of the tower nor in the walls of the church, but it does make its appearance in the external walling of the apse, and in that portion of it, to NW, which is original (p. 110).

¹ Tufa, a word the sense of which is not always understood, is 'a generic name for porous stones formed of pulverulent matter consolidated and often stratified' (*Oxford Dictionary*, s.v.). It may be formed from volcanic dust, and this is the origin of the tufa found in the neighbourhood of Rome, but it may also, as in this country, be of aqueous origin, formed from the deposits of water impregnated with lime (calcareous tufa). It is generally light and soft, but when firmly consolidated it becomes the Italian 'Travertine.'

This opens up the question of the date of the apse, but on this it must be pointed out that the form of it is not Norman and would not have been devised by the conquerors.

From the point of view of technique, after the excellent regular brickwork of St Pancras, there is nothing extant to compare with the masonry that is preserved in the ruins of the ancient church (X) known as Stone-by-Faversham, the location of which has been already given (p. 74). The oldest parts are the W ends of the chancel walls and on S the adjacent quoin of the nave. A bit of the masonry in the angle between the chancel wall and the E wall of the nave on S is shown in Fig. 54. It is composed of squared blocks of tufa and Kentish rag,




FIG. 54, Masonry of Roman character, at Stone-by-Faversham, Kent.

alternating in classical fashion with Roman tiles. There is no difficulty on the evidence now available in accepting the work as of early date, but it should be said that Mr J. T. Irvine proposed at one time to make it Norman. As a proof of this he alleged that there were marks on the N and S exterior walls of the

chancel where shallow Norman buttresses had been hacked off. Such a proceeding seems rather improbable, and the point cannot be satisfactorily settled, for Mr W. Whiting of Ospringe, who has kindly re-examined the ruin on behalf of the writer states that the ivy now renders any close inspection impossible. Mr Irvine was always inclined rather to favour Norman dates in cases of chronological difficulty.

About 675 we read of the first foundation of the (XI) Abbey of Abingdon, and the notice of it contained in its Chronicle¹ has direct architectural importance as well as

¹ *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, Rolls Series, no. 2/2, p. 272.

interest of a more general kind. 'The Minster of Abingdon,' we are told, 'which was constructed by Hean the first abbot, had the following form. In length it was 120 feet, and was rounded alike in the western part and in the eastern.' Here we meet with the plan of the double apse laid out deliberately from the first, instead of being arrived at indirectly by the addition of a second apse to one already in use, as was the case at Canterbury (p. 78). In this connection, as Commendatore Rivoira has pointed out,¹ the civil basilica excavated at Silchester is of importance. This was a long narrow building with an apse at each end, and it may have been visible in VII and given the builder of the neighbouring Abingdon his idea. The earliest example of the arrangement in Germany which afterwards became its home was at Fulda of the end of VIII, and the writer just quoted thinks that 'it may very well be that the architect of Fulda was influenced by the English Benedictine model.'² On the Plan of St Gall of early IX the Abbey church has an apse at each end.

We hear no more about the Abingdon church but the chronicler goes on to give some curious information about the arrangement of the monastery, which shows that though the apsidal church was Roman the establishment in general was of the Celtic not the classical type. Round the Minster, we are told, there were twelve separate cells and the same number of chapels, and in the cells were twelve monks, eating, drinking, and sleeping there. There was then no cloister, which was added afterwards, but they were surrounded by a high wall which served the purpose of a cloister. On Sundays however and on the principal feast days they all came together and celebrated Mass in the church, afterwards partaking of a meal in common. The main features here, the single cells and chapels and the high wall of enclosure, are of course Celtic, but the large church which on special occasions

¹ *Lombardic Architecture*, Eng. trans., Lond., 1910, II, 152.

² *ibid.*, II, 298.

received the whole community, as well as the common refectory,¹ was a concession to Roman or Benedictine practice. Hean the first Abbot was succeeded by one Conan, obviously an Irish monk, and Celtic influences evidently at first prevailed, a fact that makes the classical form of the church remarkable. This may be used as an argument in the controversy about St Peter-on-the-Wall, for it can be urged that, working in the South, Cedd might have adopted the classical forms of the locality.

¹ Sir Henry Howorth, *The Golden Days of the Early English Church*, II, 123, reads the sentence to mean that they took their meal in the church. This of course is conceivable, and in this case no refectory would be needed.

CHAPTER V

THE NORTHUMBRIAN GROUP OF EARLY MONUMENTS

WE COME now to the Northumbrian group of early churches of which the datable ones belong to about the decade of which 680 is the central point, and are associated with the two distinguished names of Benedict Biscop and Wilfrid. Though Northumbria, or more narrowly Lindisfarne, was the centre from which Celtic Christianity had spread over all England with the exception of Kent, yet Roman influences were in a measure quite as operative on the Tyne, Witham, and Ouse as by the English Channel. The actual Roman remains in the North were numerous and imposing and the Roman builders had disposed there of large material in the great squared stones that in the South were not easy to obtain of similar quality. Bede records that as early as the time of the mission of Paulinus to the North, or about 630 A.D., a 'stone church of beautiful workmanship' was erected at Lincoln, while even earlier the little timber church at York in which King Edwin had been baptized in 627 had been replaced by a handsome one of stone. The Lincoln church was battered and roofless even in Bede's day and has no monumental after-history, see Vol. I, p. 168, but the church at York (XVI) became one of the most important in Britain. At one time ruinous it was restored by Wilfrid, and though no remains have come down to us (p. 75) we possess a poetical notice of it from the pen of Alcuin the consideration of which may be deferred till Wilfrid's own work at Hexham falls to be described (p. 146 f.).

It is of no little historical significance that several important Northumbrian monuments were carried out soon after 670.

¹ *Hist. Eccl.*, II, 16.

We may trace in this the result of the Synod of Whitby which gave an immense impulse to all the Romanizing tendencies in the Church of the North, and this coincided with the appearance on the scene of two able and energetic protagonists in this movement, Benedict Biscop and Wilfrid. The former was a scholar and patron of the arts and of learning, the latter a man of boundless energy set ever on achievement, and disposing of ample means for the fulfilment of his designs. These may have been affected by that touch of megalomania of which we find evidence in some of his proceedings. The fact that he went abroad to Gaul for episcopal ordination, and secured the attendance of a dozen Gallican bishops at a very imposing ceremony, bears on this suggestion, but it is at the same time striking evidence of the personal distinction of the brilliant Northumbrian. Masterful, and indeed overweening, in all his ways, he failed as a member of the body ecclesiastical, but to tasks of a secular kind such as the design and equipment of great buildings he brought qualities of mind as well as material resources that commanded success. To his energy and to that of his contemporary Benedict Biscop is largely due the church building and church decoration that signalized the victory of the Roman party at Streanæshalch in the Synod of 664. It has been urged that the famous Ruthwell Cross is another religious and artistic memorial inspired from the same source (Vol. v, 313).

In 674 and in 681 were founded by the personal agency of Benedict the twin monasteries of (XII) Wearmouth, now Monkwearmouth close to Sunderland, and (XIII) Jarrow, on the right bank of the Tyne not far from its mouth. On both sides there remain early structures of the highest possible interest, to which close attention must be paid.

Monkwearmouth, a busy place of factories and shipyards, preserves in the centre of it, in surroundings that have not lost their old-fashioned aspect and within an ample burial ground, the church of St Peter, consisting in a tall slender W

tower, with behind it a long narrow nave flanked on N by an extensive side aisle and vestries, for the most part quite modern. The chancel arch however is of Early Norman date as is also the upper part of the tower. All the rest is Saxon and is generally ascribed to the time and the hand of the founder of the monastery. There are however certain features in the existing work that strike us as abnormal for the date thus assumed, and the current theory cannot be accepted without careful consideration.

The Saxon parts of the present church are shown in plan in Fig. 55. The nave, it will be noted, is of extraordinary length in proportion to its width measuring as it does about




FIG. 55, Plan of the Church of St Peter, Monkwearmouth, Durham.

65 ft. by a width of nearly 19 ft. It is true that the Saxon chancel is gone, if it ever existed (p. 472), but the S jamb of the present chancel arch has Early Norman character, and it is impossible to believe that the Norman builders who had no penchant for elongated plans had actually lengthened the already, to them, abnormal proportions of the Saxon nave. The present chancel arch must be in the same place as the Saxon one or if there have been any alteration it has been brought further westward. The W wall of the nave is original and is a little over 2 ft. in thickness. The S wall has been rebuilt on the original lines. The N wall has been replaced by an arcade giving access to the aisle, but the W quoin of it is still visible on the exterior, as can be seen in Fig. 56. The




FIG. 56, W tower of Church of St Peter, Monkwearmouth, Durham,
before the restoration of c. 1866.

technique is rubble-work of rudely squared stones and at the corners the stones are larger and more carefully squared and fitted, but there is none of the l. and s. or big stone quoining that we shall become familiar with in work of later periods. Height, it will be observed in Fig. 56, is here a marked feature, for the W wall of the church measures externally




FIG. 57, W doorway of porch, Monkwearmouth.

23 ft. 6 in. in width, and 31 ft. in height to the beginning of the slope of the gable, which ran upwards at an acute angle with the horizontal of about fifty degrees.

The drawing gives the line of the original gable on the N side as it was seen in 1865, before the present N aisle was built. In the centre of this W wall an arched doorway 3 ft. 6 in. in width gives admission to the interior, and to W of this is

built a porch, measuring internally 8 ft. from N to S by 9 ft. 5 in. from E to W, and covered with a barrel vault of stonework running E and W, 12 ft. 6 in. high to the crown. There are doorways to the porch on all four faces. Those to N and S, 2 ft. 6 in. in width, have their jambs rebated and heads splayed for doors opening outwards. No traces have been found of any walls of buildings forming at this part adjuncts to the church and entered through the N and S side doors of the porch. Though no marks of attachments of such walls to the walls of the porch have been noted, yet it is clear that as at Brixworth subsidiary buildings the purpose of which is uncertain (p. 337 f.) were grouped about the W end of the church, but were probably of wood (p. 472).

The E door, also with a rebate,¹ leads into the church. The W archway, 4 ft. 10 in. in width, which has never been closed by a door, is of extremely elaborate construction, and gives its stamp to the whole work (Fig. 57). Its jambs are composed of upright slabs lining the opening, surmounted by other slabs laid flat and bonding into the wall. On the surfaces thus formed there is carved on each side of the doorway an ornament consisting of a pair of animals intertwined, after a fashion which will be understood from the drawing, Fig. 58, which shows the condition of the slabs when first uncovered in 1865. On these slabs, as on a plinth, stand on each side two stone shafts, about 21 in. high by 10 in. in diameter, ornamented with an elaborate system of projections and cuts, that have evidently been produced in a lathe. These turned mouldings are far superior in their delicacy and accurate cutting (Fig. 59) to the general run of Saxon baluster shafts.

These twin colonnettes carry a massive impost 11 in. high, chamfered beneath, and worked on all its edges with a roll moulding. From these springs the arch, formed of nine carefully cut voussoir stones of varying sizes, running right

¹ Owing to the rebate, the actual apertures of the doors on N, S, and E of the porch have somewhat smaller dimensions than those given above.

through the thickness of the arch, and once recessed on both outer and inner face, after the manner of the ionic architrave. The arris between the face and the soffit of the arch is worked into a roll like that on the edges of the imposts. Above the arch, at a height of 13 ft. 3 in. above the ground, the face of



FIG. 58, S jamb of doorway to porch,
Monkwearmouth, Durham.




FIG. 59, Turned shaft
from jamb of W door
to porch, Monkwear-
mouth, Durham.

the porch is enriched with a flat string course, composed of various panels that can be seen in good light to be carved in low relief with representations of four-footed animals, and at least one human figure.

At a higher level comes a comparatively large window, giving light to a chamber over the porch. The date of this window is problematical ; it is slightly splayed internally,

from an aperture of 2 ft. 6 in. to an inner width of 2 ft. 10 in., and has a cable moulding worked on the inside arris as in other parts of the porch. The arch of the outer aperture has in any case been modernized, but the inner one looks antique. From this chamber also a narrow doorway, now the only means of access to the interior of the tower, forms a communication with the nave of the church. The aperture of this doorway towards the nave, only 1 ft. 5 in. wide, has been modernized, but within the chamber where it is 2 ft. 6 in. wide its head was cut in a single big stone, and the construction of it shows clearly that it is an original feature. On the N external face of the tower can be seen the marks of a square headed doorway now blocked, that is at a height which would admit of access from the exterior to the chamber above the vault. This doorway however does not seem part of the original work. In connection with this a view of the church in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol. LXXXII/2, p. 513, may be consulted.

Returning to the W face of the porch on the exterior, we notice above the large window a second string course, and from this level, at a height of 21 ft. above the ground, began the slope of the original gable that surmounted the porch. Under the apex of this gable there are five large stones let into the wall, the uppermost of which projects like a semicircular disc set horizontally, while the second shows the outline and shape of a human head, measuring c. 10½ in. by 7 in., the right ear being clearly visible, while on the left side of the face there is the mark of a moustache (p. 471). The two large stones next below have been hacked away flush with the wall, and the lowest has evidently been renewed in more modern times. It is clear that there was a statue here in high relief, about 6 ft. in height, and as it is placed with reference to the original gable, and has no marks of being a later insertion, it is clearly original.

At this point occurs the junction of the original work of the vaulted porch with chamber over it, and the later tower

reared upon its walls. On the W side of the tower as it at present stands there are clearly seen the sloping lines of the original gable over the porch, and that the upper part of the tower is a later addition is further proved by the fact that, to a great extent, it blocks out the light from the two original windows in the W wall of the nave. These windows are seen in the sketch of the interior (Fig. 60). The tower walls outside rise in front of these windows, and light is only admitted by splaying away the edge of the tower wall where it abuts on that of the nave, leaving an upright slit, the position of which is marked by the arrow at A, in Fig. 56. It must be remarked about these windows that they are splayed in the interior only, the aperture for light being 1 ft. 8 in. across and the width of the internal splay 2 ft. 9 in., and they have the peculiarity that in the lower part of their jambs, underneath the upright slabs that form these jambs, there are set baluster shafts of a kind similar to those in the porch though not so elaborate in execution. They are built firmly into the corners of the jambs and have their bases on a narrow ledge from which the sloping sill of the window rises at their back. They are the same height as the slope of the sills,




FIG. 60, Sketch of the W wall of the nave, Monkwearmouth, from the interior.

so that the top of them comes on a level with the bottom of the actual aperture of the window.

The existence of these shafts was only made known at the restoration of 1866,¹ previous to which the windows were covered up with plaster. It must be assumed that they are in their original position, and were intended as counterparts to the balusters in the external opening of the porch. The effect of them in the window jambs is however not very satisfactory. The upper part of the tower possesses features common to the numerous square W towers in other parts which will be noticed in later chapters.

In connection with the relative dates of the various portions of the structure, and especially the question whether or not the porch and the nave walls are the original work of Benedict Biscop in VII, or at any rate near his time, a brief note on the history of the site may here be introduced.

We possess in the writings of Bede an almost contemporary notice of the first building of the abbey of Wearmouth.² Bede's account has been so often quoted that it is sufficient to say here that the founder of the monastery, in the year 675 A.D. went over to Gaul and brought back with him some masons to build for him a stone church 'after the manner of the Romans in which he ever took delight.' To Gaul moreover he sent for certain workers in glass ; and for sundry fittings of the church not elsewhere to be procured he went himself on more than one journey to Rome. The fabric of the church must have been slight, for it only took a year to build ; it was on the other hand tolerably spacious, for even in Bede's time the community of monks in the combined monasteries of Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, of which

¹ *The Ecclesiologist* (Cambridge Camden Society) for 1866, p. 362, and the *Transactions* of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland, vol. 1, p. 141, and appendix, contain notices of the church at the time of these restorations, with many valuable illustrations. For the results of quite recent investigations of the building see (p. 470 f.).

² *Historia Abbatum*, c. 5, Plummer's Bede, 1, 368.

the former was the chief, numbered 600 souls. It was not the only church in the monastery however, for we read also of a church of Our Lady and an oratory of St Laurence, but it formed the place of assembly of the monks on important occasions, and was profusely adorned with several sets of paintings, had glazed windows, and a full equipment of sacred vessels, fittings, and vestments.

The question naturally arises whether any of the work of Benedict's masons actually survives. We know that the sister establishments at Wearmouth and Jarrow flourished until the time of the disastrous inroads of the Danes, who, in the year 875, plundered and almost destroyed the churches and monasteries of Northumbria. From that date to the time of the Norman Conquest they disappear from the pages of history, but shortly after the Conquest they are, for a time, revived, and become once more the seats of monastic communities. In 1083 however the monks from these restored monasteries are transferred to Durham, and the houses of Wearmouth and Jarrow sink to the position of unimportant subordinate cells to the great cathedral abbey.

It is of course conceivable that the church of Benedict Biscop, the rapid erection of which has just been referred to, might require rebuilding in the two hundred years between its first erection and the Danish invasion. We may accordingly ascribe the work or portions of it (1) to the founder's own time, (2) to some epoch in the two succeeding centuries, (3) to the period between 875 and the Norman Conquest, or, again, (4) to the era of revival from about 1075 to 1083. With this latest date would accord the style of the Early Norman pier of the present chancel arch at the E end of the building, the half-columns of which possess the curious bulbous base which occurs in other examples of XI work in England, such as the crypt at Lastingham and the slype at Worcester; while, though the plan, with the three half-columns, appears Saxon, the masonry and tooling are charac-

teristically Norman. The upper part of the tower, again, agrees closely in style with the numerous examples of square W towers, occurring in Northumberland, Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, and other parts, which belong certainly, with some exceptions, to XI, but the exact chronology of which, with the conditions of their erection, will have to be considered carefully in the sequel. Of the Monkwearmouth tower the total height is 60 ft., which, on a face width of a little over 11 ft., represents proportions far taller and more slender than are normal in later English architecture. It is not reduced by sets-off, nor was it intended to taper, though the weight of the tower bearing on the W archway has caused it to spread slightly, and made the tower measure an inch or two more at the base than at the summit. This upper portion of the tower may appear to some earlier than the chancel arch, but it is more probable that the two are practically contemporary, and coeval too with the tower at Jarrow, which is Norman rather than Saxon in character.

The questions of date now narrow themselves down to the query whether the lower portion of the tower and W end of the nave, which we have seen to be prior to the upper part of the tower, are due to an earlier restoration after 875 but before the Conquest, or are relics of the pre-Danish period. Now, Symeon of Durham, writing in Northumbria in the early years of XII, describes the havoc wrought by the Danes as so extensive that the monasteries of the province were reduced to a desert condition, only bare walls being left, and the very sites of some passing out of knowledge altogether. The revival of 1075 was brought about by a pious pilgrimage undertaken by some monks from the south of England, who 'had learned from the history of the Angles how that the province of the Northumbrians was formerly the home of crowds of saintly monks,' and who wished to visit the holy but now deserted sites.¹ When the country had been reduced

¹ *Hist. Dunelm. Eccl.*, III, 21, Rolls Series, no. 75/1, p. 108 f.

to such a condition, it is almost certain that any rebuilding of the churches ruined by the Danes would have been of a somewhat perfunctory character. The earliest work at Monkwearmouth is however marked by extreme care and elaboration in detail. The baluster shafts, the interlaced animals, the roll mouldings, the cable mouldings, the carved frieze of animals, the big figure relief in the gable, the balusters in the window jambs, are not everyday work, but represent quite the most extensive collection of carefully wrought details to be found in the whole range of extant Saxon buildings. It would have been practically impossible in that region between 875 and XI, while for its ingenuity and thoroughness it is exactly what we should expect either from the wealthy and enthusiastic Benedict, or from one or two of his successors during the flourishing period of the foundation. It is a point to emphasize that none of the known later features which have been mentioned, the pilaster strips, the double splayed windows and the like, make their appearance at Monkwearmouth, while on the other hand in the barrel vault over the W porch it exhibits a unique feature, the only extant example of a Saxon vault in masonry above ground. It agrees exactly in its character with the barrel vaults of Wilfrid's crypts at Ripon and Hexham that can be dated with certainty to this very decade, and there is no later Saxon parallel. The details of the W archway, though quite abnormal, suggest as we have just seen in their careful execution an early date. In style the archivolt is classical. The baluster shafts, though there is nothing like them among the Roman remains in the country, are turned on the lathe by a process that we know the Romans used for their small shafts (p. 59). The intertwined creatures on the jambs are not classical but their prototypes in style can be found in Teutonic tomb furniture, as on a gilt bronze pendant ornamented with interlaced animals in the Museum at Stratford-on-Avon, from the Bidford-on-Avon cemetery, a

scramasax in the Museum at Zürich, or a Swedish piece of the migration period figured by Sune Lindqvist in his 'Studier Tillägnade Oscar Almgren,' published in *Rig* for 1819. Apart from the bodies, the motive of interlacing bills occurs in the Gospels of Lindisfarne, f. 26, b. There is nothing in the enrichment that suggests influence from the side of the Vikings or of the Normans.

So far as can be seen, the vault and all the rest of the features of the porch are contemporary with its fabric, and the porch as a whole ranges with the W wall of the nave, not only in its lower portion but as high as the windows, the baluster shafts in which resemble in style those on the jambs of the porch. All this evidence seems to make for the early date, but it cannot be concealed from view that there are characteristics in the work that would suit better VIII or IX than VII. One of these is the great height of the nave walls, which is a peculiarity found neither in the basilicas of Romanized lands nor in the Celtic oratories, but which seems to have come into vogue in parts of the Continent as well as in England in the times of unrest and danger when the Vikings forced their keels up the rivers of western and central Europe. There are a number of early churches in the northern and central districts of France, constructed in petit appareil, that used to be thought Merovingian but are now by de Lasteyrie, Cam. Enlart, and others made Carolingian or post-Carolingian, some of which, such as Chanceau-sur-Choisille in the Loire district, look very like our own Saxon churches. The above has rubble masonry of small stones embedded in abundant mortar, a lofty range of r. h. windows, and walls some 30 ft. high. Lofty walls and apertures high up in them were a means of protection against raiders. The great proportionate length of the nave is another feature that offers a contrast to the normal relations of length and breadth found in the early buildings already noticed in the South and the Midlands, but accepting it as

a Saxon peculiarity there seems no intelligible reason why it should not occur early. These considerations, which make us hesitate to accept unreservedly the authorship of Benedict himself for the existing early work at Monkwearmouth, apply also in the case of Escomb (XIV) where archaic features are similarly combined with a remarkable height and length in the nave.

(XIII) Jarrow offers points of interest of its own that are at the same time points of difficulty. There are considerable remains on the site, which though in a region of factories is surrounded with ample open spaces, and is a frequented place of pilgrimage. The church is flanked on S by fragments of the ancient abbey buildings in the Early Norman style and in massive stonework much corroded by the chemically charged air of the district. The church now consists in an ample nave of quite modern date and a N porch within which is preserved a large collection of baluster shafts and other carved stones of interest. At the E end of the modern nave comes a tower in the same Early Norman style as the monastic buildings just mentioned, and passing through the arches at the base of the tower we find ourselves in a chancel of spacious dimensions, 41 ft. 6 in. long and 15 ft. 9 in. wide, the architecture of which is of the most archaic character. It should be stated that the modern nave replaces one that was destroyed in the year 1783 of which we have an account in Hutchinson's *History of Durham*, published in 1785 (p. 20).¹

In the N wall of this older nave at its E end were two stones bearing an inscription in Roman characters that are now built into the W wall of the tower over the W tower arch. It purports to commemorate the dedication of the church in the year 685 by Abbot Ceolfrid who had been

¹ See *The Reliquary*, July, 1893. Mr. Hodges's account is the completest that has been given of the church, and what is said here is largely based upon it.

charged by Benedict Biscop with the establishment and conduct of the monastery. It begins with the Constantinian monogram and continues ¹

DEDICATIO BASILICAE
SCI PAULI VIII K̄L MAI
ANNO XV ECFRIDI REG
CEOLFRIDI ABB EIUSDEM Q
Q² ECCLES DO³ AUCTORE
CONDITORIS ANNO IIII

That the old nave was Saxon there can be no doubt, but whether it was the original church of the monastery it would be hazardous to affirm, as we know little more about it than what we are told of its extraordinary proportions. When we pass through the tower into what is now the chancel we acquire more assurance, for the well preserved little building has all the marks of very high antiquity. It is certainly too large for an Anglo-Saxon chancel of the early time, but there is clear evidence that it was once a nave, for, to quote Mr Hodges, 'in the east wall are two straight joints equidistant from the north and south angles, from which foundations have been traced eastwards,' a sure indication that there was once here a small altar house, while the original W termination of the nave is also visible in straight joints and quoin stones in the N and S walls where they approach the tower. The walling is solidly put together of fairly large rudely squared stones and the interior is lighted by windows some of which are undoubtedly original. Their construction is of a kind which we shall see presently represented at Escomb. They are internally splayed, with jambs in the 'upright and flat' or 'Escomb' technique already

¹ 'The dedication of the basilica of St Paul the 9th before the Calends of May in the 15th year of King Ecgfrid and the 4th of Abbot Ceolfrid who under God founded the same church.'

² 'quoque.'

³ 'Deo.' The date is calculated by Mr Plummer, in his *Bede*, II, 361, as April 23, 685.

illustrated, Fig. 30, and heads cut out of a single stone. Two of those in the S wall have preserved a curious feature that may be of historical significance. Though the original external apertures are quite small they have been at some undefined period filled in with stone slabs in which have been cut exiguous openings of the space of a few square inches. Comment on this curious arrangement must be deferred (p. 202). Besides these small windows which resemble those in the W wall at Monkwearmouth there are traces of larger ones higher up in the walls that to Mr C. C. Hodges appeared earlier.

The curious arrangement of the buildings on the site has been explained on the hypothesis that there were two contiguous but separate churches, one the long building that had originally at the end of it a small chancel, and the other, a few yards to the E of it, the structure just described that had its own little altar house at its E end. Such duplication or multiplication of churches in monasteries, and not only in those of the Celtic type, is quite normal, and we know that there were three in the monastery at Monkwearmouth. At St Augustine, Canterbury, there were three in a line, SS. Peter and Paul, St Mary, and St Pancras. At Jarrow the churches, with all the rest of the conventual buildings, were ruined by the Danes, but there, as at Wearmouth, a restoration was carried out in early Norman times and the two churches were joined into one, the space between them being occupied by a tower. Both of the small altar houses were taken down and the nave of the long church carried on up to the tower. On the other side of the tower the nave of the other smaller church was made into a chancel, its own altar house being suppressed. A tower between a nave and a chancel had as we shall see become in late Saxon times a quite familiar phenomenon, while the idea of joining two churches in the axial direction into one appears in Wulfric's Late-Saxon scheme at St Augustine (p. 87).

The first two examples on this list of the monuments of VII in the North, Wearmouth and Jarrow, offer to us problems which especially at Jarrow are of no small difficulty. It is satisfactory to be able to turn to a specimen of Anglian work that is all of one period and that is stamped with an unmistakable character of high antiquity. This is (XIV) Escomb, a building about which we have no literary records, but which exhibits a reliance on Roman materials and forms that makes an early date a practical certainty.¹ At the same time, while Roman in technique it shows Celtic affinities in its plan, and it possesses also the intriguing characteristics, which, as we have seen, present difficulties at Monkwearmouth, of great length of nave and height of walls. The church is situated in a mining village two or three miles from Bishop Auckland, Co. Durham, and can boast of the unique distinction, that, a practically untouched Anglo-Saxon church of about VII, it has remained in use for its original purpose for some twelve hundred years. It was put out of service in 1863 when a new church was built at the other end of the village, and it is a curious fact that at that time it had not been suspected of any antiquarian value. Its exceptional interest was recognized by the late Canon Greenwell and others in 1879 and since 1880 it has been kept religiously in repair and used for services. Thanks are due to the present vicar, the Rev. William Hodgson, for the intelligent care he lavishes on the church and his courtesy to the pilgrims who visit it.

The plan, Fig. 61, and the general view, Fig. 62, exhibit the proportions on which a word has just been said. The gable, probably reconstructed, is sharply pointed, and in Fig. 62 it is seen surmounting the original E wall of the chancel, a feature very rarely preserved in our Saxon churches. The view enables a judgment to be formed of the technique.

¹ Rivoira, II, 175, ascribes Escomb to XI. He omits to note the early features of the internally played windows and rebated doors.

The walls which are 2 ft. 3 in. or 4 in. thick are constructed for the most part of squared stones of ample size, very many of which show by their tooling or other marks upon them that they are Roman stones brought from a neighbouring station of the legions. Blocks of a specially large size are used for the quoins and some of these are 1 ft. 6 in. to 2 ft. in height by 3 ft. to 4 ft. in length. Notice should be taken of the manner in which they are laid. They are set up on edge and extend like slabs along the wall alternately N and S and E and W, and there is no trace of the technique of l. and s. work. That the E and S windows of the chancel and two of the S windows of the nave are of later insertion is obvious




FIG. 61, Plan of Escomb Church, Durham.

at a glance, and the S porch is also comparatively modern. Of the sundial above it an illustration was given Vol. v, 174, and a recent examination from a ladder satisfied the writer that it is original and in situ.

When we enter the building the narrow and lofty proportions make an immediate impression, Fig. 63. The nave measures 43 ft. 6 in. by 14 ft. 6 in., while the small square ended chancel is only about 10 ft. in length and breadth. The most striking feature of the interior and indeed of the church at large is the chancel arch, see also Fig. 30 (p. 54), which has a height of 15 ft. by a width of 5 ft. 3 in., and is constructed of large stones that all go through the whole thickness of the wall, 2 ft. 4 in., and are carefully squared or cut truly to the wedge shaped voussoir form. The jambs




FIG. 62, Escomb Church, Durham, from SE.

are constructed after the fashion explained on (p. 53), and illustrated from the Roman arch at Pola, and the expression 'Escomb fashion' is used for it in these pages.




FIG. 63, Interior view of Escomb Church, Durham.

There can be little doubt that, as we shall see was the case also at Corbridge, we are dealing here with an actual Roman arch re-used. Such arches must have existed in connection with the numerous fine stone buildings in the

Roman stations in the North, excellent specimens of which, preserved for several courses of masonry above their floors, came to light recently at Corstopitum. If Corstopitum supplied the Corbridge arch, the Roman station of Vinovium now Binchester, only 4 or 5 miles away, may have furnished to Escomb its chancel arch as well as the very numerous Roman stones used there in the walling.¹ The imposts of the arch are chamfered, and the impost stone on S on the





FIG. 64 A, N doorway of nave,
Escomb, interior view.



B, N doorway of nave, Escomb,
exterior view.

sinister side in the illustration is thicker than the other, so that a portion of the jamb is cut in the same stone below the chamfer. A glance at the Roman door jamb in Fig. 25 (p. 49) will reveal the same peculiarity.

Next in order may be noticed the two ancient doorways surmounted by flat lintels. They are both in the N walls, one, now built up, in that of the chancel and the other, shown in Fig. 64, A and B, in the wall of the nave. The jambs, it will be noticed, are constructed like those of the chancel arch. There is however the further peculiarity which we meet with

¹ On one of these stones in the N wall near E is the inscription, now upside down, LEG VI. The sixth legion furnished garrisons for the northern stations.

here for the first time, that the jambs are slightly inclined so that the doorway measures 3 ft. in width above, but 3 ft. 3 in. below. This N opening it must be observed is rebated for a wooden door, which was kept closed by the common device of the wooden bar that played into a recess in the stonework of the jamb. On the outside we find the curious arrangement that the flat lintel and the jambs are mortised into each other after a fashion that reminds us of the Roman gateway shown





FIG. 65 A, Round headed window internally splayed, S side of nave, Escomb.



B, Square headed window, N side of nave, Escomb.

in Fig. 26 (p. 50). A similar peculiarity will meet us in work of X at Britford near Salisbury (p. 222). Besides these two N doorways the present S doorway of the nave is an original opening though it has been altered in modern times. Part of the E jamb is ancient. It must be remarked that the N and S doors are not opposite each other, though this symmetrical arrangement is commonly found.

The small original lights on both sides of the nave are noteworthy, Fig. 65, A and B. The two on N are flat headed but the S pair have round heads cut out of single stones, or rather out of two single stones set one behind the other to make up the thickness of the wall. The innermost lintel of

the SE window is fully 7 ft. in length. Both windows are internally splayed and have markedly sloping jambs. The aperture is in each case on the outer face of the wall and measures some 2 ft. 8 in. by 1 ft. 5 in. The internal opening is about 5 ft. high by a mean of about 2 ft. 7 in. in width. The groove for a shutter is visible on the jambs of the r. h. light. No original openings are preserved in the chancel but there is one high up in the W gable of the nave.

There are remains of old, possibly original, plastering on parts of the walling of the church, and a bit of pebble flooring in the NW corner. On the exterior of the W wall are indications that there was once some structure built up against it, perhaps some form of the W adjunct of which we have already noted traces at St Peter-on-the-Wall (p. 103), Brixworth (p. 114), and elsewhere.

(XV) Corbridge is not so complete as Escomb but supplies us with another fine example of Romanizing construction, while the Roman material, especially in the tower arch, is much in evidence. The modern town lies almost opposite Hexham on the N bank of the Tyne, where one of the great Roman roads to




FIG. 66, Porch and W end of nave, Corbridge, Northumberland.

the far North crossed the Wall of Hadrian on its course into Caledonia. The important Roman station of Corstopitum lies a little to the W of it. The pre-Conquest church, the nave of which survives, was entered through an ample W porch the plan of which is given in Fig. 66, reproduced by permission from one by Mr C. C. Hodges, who made a thorough study of the building

many years ago. The following description is taken from that by Mr Hodges in *The Reliquary* of January, 1893. 'The porch was entered by a round-headed doorway, five feet wide,

and more than nine feet high, having a semi-circular arch. Above this is another semi-circular arch which is partly constructional, as it serves as a relieving arch, and partly ornamental, as its voussoirs are ornamented with a very early example of chevron work. This consists of a row of saltires, one on each voussoir, which vary in size. Immediately over the doorway is a small window with round head, widely splayed on the inside. Between the porch and the nave is a great entrance archway, eight feet two inches wide, and sixteen feet high' (Fig. 67). 'The jambs are quite plain, and are formed of enormous stones, each one of which is as long as the wall is thick, so that there are no vertical joints in the jambs. At a height of ten feet six inches from the floor are projecting impost stones ten inches thick. These are of different sections on the two sides, and are Roman mouldings re-used, having been taken from the base or cornice of some great building. The arch is stilted to the extent of a foot. The voussoirs, of which there are thirteen, above the springing line, are two feet four inches long, and go right through the wall; they are, however, three inches thinner than the wall. This difference is left as a recess on the east side, but does not extend to the two stones immediately above the impost which stilt the arch. It is clear from this, as from the dressing of the stones, that the arch has been bodily transferred from a Roman gateway, and merely re-set in its present position. The surrounding walls are almost, if not entirely, of Roman worked stone. Cramp holes and grooves, lewis holes, and broached tooling are everywhere visible, and the wavy, uneven surface of the walls, now that they are denuded of their plaster, although built of large square stones, shows that these did not always fit the thickness of the wall they were being built into.

'The nave was about forty-eight feet long, and seventeen feet eight inches wide, and about twenty-nine feet high to the wall-head. It was lighted by three windows on either

side, a considerable portion of the heads of two of which are still in situ in the north wall. From these remains we gather




FIG. 67, W portal, Corbridge, Northumberland.

that they were of the same form and dimension as the still perfect window over the west door. The heads are in two stones only, one forming the internal arch and the other the

external arch. The jambs, however, are formed of long through-stones. The inner head stones are by far the larger, as the splay is considerable. . . .

'The ancient chancel, and the arch opening to it, have entirely disappeared, and the indications to show the terminations of the nave in this direction are but slight. The west gable however remains entire, and shows that the roof, which seems to have been of thatch, probably ling, was of very high pitch, its ridge being nearly fifty-two feet from the ground.

'At some period before the Conquest the roof of the porch was taken off and the gable removed. The side walls were then carried sheer up beyond the gable of the nave to form a tower. The north, south, and west walls of this were built on the walls of the west porch, but the east wall rested on the western gable of the nave. It is fortunate that this gable was not removed like that of the porch, or we should never have known how the change had been effected. The modern roof of the nave is much lower, both at the eaves and the ridge, than that of the early church, and portions of the west wall of the old nave now flank the tower, like buttresses which seem to rise up through the roof. The old gable window is now above the roof, and what is now its external side was formerly inside, and beneath the old roof, and its original external face is now to be seen inside the tower.'

To this description from the pen of Mr Hodges there needs to be added the note that in the case of the window in the W gable of the nave just mentioned we find presented what looks at first sight like a double splay. There is the wide external splay which was originally internal, and a smaller splay on what is now the inner face of the wall. This, if original, would make the window a double splayed one and there are chronological reasons (p. 251) which would make this impossible. An examination of the window shows however that this inner splay has merely been hacked away

in more recent times to let in additional light to the ringing-chamber. The window is really a single- or internally-splayed one like those at Monkwearmouth, Jarrow, and Escomb.

Returning to the nave we may note again that the W arch is one of the most remarkable features of its kind in England. Its great height, and the large stones of which it is constructed, give it an imposing aspect that its absolute plainness only enhances. The arch we have just seen to be undoubtedly Roman re-used, but with respect to the jambs it must be noted that while wrought with splendid massiveness they do not show the slab-like stones set alternately upright and flat or 'Escomb fashion,' so that the masonry of the Corbridge jambs, though the stones were originally Roman, may be of Anglian setting. Within the last year or two our knowledge of the Saxon nave has been considerably increased by the discovery of the floor of the Saxon nave underneath the early mediaeval pavement contemporary with the pointed arches cut through the Saxon walls when the N and S aisles were added. This floor is now visible in more than one place by the piers of the later N arcade. This and other Saxon indications were shown and explained to the writer by Mr John Gibson, F.S.A., whom one is glad to see gathering round him the mantle worn so long and effectively by his father, Mr John Pattison Gibson, to whom Northumbrian archaeology owes so much.

(XVI) (XVII) (XVIII) York, Ripon, Hexham, are all connected with the name of Wilfrid. (XVI) The metropolitan church of the northern Province began, Bede tells us,¹ with a hastily built oratory of wood which was soon after enclosed in or replaced by one of stone which was begun by Edwin and completed later on by Oswald. Pagan reaction and the disorders of the times account for the fact that within about thirty years the building was half a ruin, and now about 669

¹ *Hist. Eccl.*, II, 14.

when Wilfrid was reinstated in his see of York he repaired the cathedral putting in new windows and refacing with white plaster the walls. The restored church however only lasted till 741 when Symeon of Durham¹ tells us that the 'monasterium' in York was burnt down. It was restored, or an entirely new minster was erected to take its place, by Archbishop Æthelbert or Albert who was consecrated in 767, and of this we have a notice in a poem ascribed on good grounds to the famous Alcuin.² The verses run as follows

Haec nimis alta domus solidis suffulta columnis,
 Suppositae quae stant curvatis arcubus, intus
 Emicat egregiis laquearibus atque fenestris,
 Pulchraque porticibus fulget circumdata multis,
 Plurima diversis retinens solaria tectis,
 Quae triginta tenet variis ornatibus aras,

and may be thus rendered :—'This house of soaring height, upborne by massive columns which support round arches, is glorious within, with its splendid coffered ceilings and its windows. Girt around with many aisles it shines there in its beauty, and holds within it many upper chambers with varied roofing. Thirty altars it contains adorned with enrichments manifold.' The points to be noted in this description are (1) the numerous 'porticus' that girt it round by which we may understand aisles or side chapels, for the word would cover both (p. 89); (2) the mention of 'solaria' which certainly implies upper chambers or galleries of some kind;³ (3) the remarkable number of thirty altars. To these points we shall have to return in connection with Wilfrid's buildings at Hexham.

(XVII) (XVIII) Ripon and Hexham which were almost contemporary must be taken together, for they agree so closely in the only parts of each that have come down to us intact

¹ *Hist. Reg.*, sub anno DCCXLI.

² *Historians of the Church of York*, Rolls Series, no. 71/1, lxi.

³ So Dehio and von Bezold, i, 282.

that we may assume correspondence in those that have been destroyed. The crypts that remain on both sites will be noticed together on a subsequent page (p. 161). As regards the churches themselves we hear practically nothing about Ripon but the following sentence in Eddius' Life of Wilfrid,¹ 'Nam in Hrypis basilicam polito lapide a fundamentis in terra usque ad summum aedificatam, variis columnis et porticibus suffultam, in altum erexit et consummavit'—'for at Ripon he began a church of smoothed stonework from foundations in the earth and carried it up to the summit in the same material with the support of numerous columns and aisles, completing it to its full elevation.' Here again we note (1) that the church was basilican ; (2) that it was built of dressed stone ; (3) that columns were used between nave and aisles. In both descriptions emphasis is placed on height, but this need not have any special significance.

Hexham, the last of the VII examples, will occupy far more space than any other of the buildings already passed in review, for notable things are said about it by the older writers, the interpretation of which brings us face to face with difficult but interesting questions. Moreover on the site there have been recent excavations and discoveries, not carried far enough to secure any very definite results, but of sufficient moment to necessitate careful study.

¹ *Historians*, etc., ubi supra, 25.

CHAPTER VI

HEXHAM AND WILFRID

(XVIII) THE site at Hexham, with the region about it, was granted to Wilfrid by Queen Æthelthryth not earlier than 672¹ and Prior Richard of Hexham says that the Abbey was founded about 674.² Wilfrid evacuated his see of Hexham in 678, but was restored to it about 686, remaining in possession for five years. Away from it again in 691, he was restored after the Synod on the Nidd in 705, and he enjoyed four more years of peaceful possession till his death at Oundle in 709. Acca, his successor at Hexham, 'enriched the structure of the church with manifold adornments and marvellous workmanship.'³ We may suppose from this that Wilfrid in the first period of his Hexham life, c. 674-678, worked his main fabric into shape and between 686 and 691 with the last four years of his episcopate completed the structure, leaving it to Bishop Acca his loving adherent and successor to finish its decoration and fittings. Rapid work at the beginning can be postulated, for Eddius tells us⁴ that when Wilfrid came north after his visit for episcopal consecration to Gaul he had with him stone masons and craftsmen skilled in all kinds of art. Some of these he may have brought with him from Gaul for Aelred of Rievaulx in the Prologue to his *Saints of Hexham* says that Wilfrid worked 'adductis secum ex partibus transmarinis artificibus,' and

¹ Plummer's Bede, II, 318.

² Raine, *Priory of Hexham*, Surtees Society, 1863, I, 3.

³ Bede, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 20.

⁴ *Historians of the Church of York*, Rolls Series, no. 71/1, 22.

Benedict Biscop certainly procured masons from Gaul.¹ Others may have been south countrymen ; for Eddius himself was brought by Wilfrid from Kent as an expert in church music. William of Malmesbury² and Prior Richard of Hexham³ state that Wilfrid brought masons with him from Rome for his English work, but Eddius says nothing of this, and the statement may be put down to the Romanizing tendencies of twelfth century writers, against which the reader has already been cautioned (Vol. I, p. 158). At any rate Wilfrid's establishment was technically equipped for building operations.

Furthermore the construction was greatly facilitated by an ample supply of large squared stones of excellent quality obtained from Roman buildings. That the source of this supply was the important Roman station of Corstopitum across the Tyne would naturally be assumed, and is proved by a curious discovery made in 1887 in the river bed. There 'on a spot pointed out by tradition as an ancient fording place, were found three big Roman stones. It would appear as if a cartload had been accidentally overturned on its way from Corbridge to Hexham, and the stones left in the stream, the workmen preferring to return for a new load rather than incur the labour of raising and reloading them.'⁴ The existing crypt and other possible surviving parts of Wilfrid's fabric are built of Roman stones, and it is quite likely that the Roman material used at Hexham in the so-called Manor Office, really a mediaeval gaol building of XIV, came from the ruins of Wilfrid's abbey church.

In dealing with this important monument we have to consider (1) the literary notices relating to it, one of which is practically contemporary ; (2) the general history of the site

¹ Bede, *Historia Abbatum*, § 5.

² *Gesta Pontificum*, Rolls Series, no. 52, p. 255.

³ *Priory of Hexham*, I, p. 20.

⁴ *A History of Northumberland*, Vol. III, Newcastle, 1896, p. 240.

and the buildings from VII to the later mediaeval period, and (3) the Hexham structures in the light of the excavations and reconstruction which were carried on during the first decade of the present century under the energetic guidance of the then rector, Canon Sidney Savage.¹

I THE LITERARY NOTICES

The contemporary notice is contained in the 22nd chapter of Eddius's *Life of Wilfrid*, written soon after his master's death, and while the author was in touch with Acca who completed the Hexham buildings. He is therefore writing of structures with which he was familiar, but he was at the same time quite uncritical and not possessed of any technical knowledge of the arts of construction and decoration. The description he gives of Wilfrid's work must be taken in connection with the much later notices by Prior Richard of Hexham drawn up about the middle of XII, and by other XII north-country writers, such as Symeon of Durham, and Aelred of Rievaulx. Prior Richard's account is more wordy than that of Eddius, but when carefully scanned it seems to consist almost entirely in enlargements of what the earlier writer has said, and the same applies in the main to the other XII writers. In order to make this clear the passages are printed below in translation in such a way as to render comparison easy. The column on the dexter side is given up to Eddius, while that on the reader's right contains the parallel passages of XII, beginning with that of Prior Richard. The passages are broken up so as to bring together the clauses which are parallel. Some important clauses in Prior Richard independent of Eddius, and some other passages of XII

¹ These are described in the well-illustrated brochure by the Rev. Canon Savage and C. C. Hodges, architect, entitled *A Record*, etc., and published at Hexham in 1907. See also *A Guide to the Priory Church of St Andrew, Hexham*, by C. C. Hodges and John Gibson, F.S.A., second ed., Hexham, 1921; and the same authors' *Hexham and Its Abbey*, Hexham, 1919.

are printed in Italics. All the pieces are given in the original Latin at the foot of (p. 154 f.). Each is numbered, (a) (b) (c) etc.

EDDIUS

PRIOR RICHARD

(The Crypt)

Ch. xxii. 'The deeper part of the building was founded in the earth with chambers constructed of finely polished stones.' (a)

i, ch. iii. 'The deeper part of the church itself he founded in the earth beneath with crypts and subterranean oratories and winding ways wrought with great pains and care.' (b)

(The Main Building)

'And above ground the structure was manifold, borne up by numerous columns and many side-chapels [porticus, see (p. 89)] exhibiting a marvellous length and height of walling, with various winding ways all round it, carried sometimes up and sometimes down in spiral stair turrets.' (c)

'He reared the walls of immense length and height of squared (stones?)¹ and supported by numerous and finely polished columns *and divided into three stories*. . . . The body of the church itself he surrounded on all sides by adjuncts and side-chapels, which with wonderful and most subtle artifice he divided into lower and upper stories, with partition walls and spiral stair turrets. In these stair turrets and over them there were ascents of stone and level passages and many winding ways, some leading up, others down, so cunningly contrived that an immense multitude of men could be there on all sides of the main building of the church, though no one of them could be seen by anybody from below.' (d)

¹ See also the phrase underlined in the passage from Aelred of Rievaulx given below, passage (I). It has been suggested that 'quadratis' may mean square piers as alternating with the columns mentioned afterwards, but the Aelred passage is against this interpretation.

*(Purpose of the Side-Chapels)**(Collection of relics)*

c. xxxiii. (Wilfrid on his departure from Rome in 680) 'went round for many days to pray at the places sacred to the saints, and obtained from men specially expert a goodly store of sacred relics for the benefit of the churches of Britain, noting down in each case the name of the saint whose relic it was, so that he possessed himself after his wont of precious things too numerous to mention for the adornment of the house of God.' (e)

c. lv. (Again, in 704, as he left Rome for England) 'he collected from experts sacred relics attested by names, and hangings of purple and silk for the adornment of his churches.' (f)

(Disposal of relics)

'Moreover with much labour and care he arranged very numerous oratories above and below, of great beauty and privacy, in the various side-chapels, wherein he made honourable provision for altars in honour of the Blessed Mary, the Mother of God and ever virgin, and of St Michael the archangel, and St John Baptist, and the holy Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, and Virgins, each with its proper furnishings. *Of these oratories there are some that even to this day are still in view, rising aloft like towers or bulwarks.*' (g)

c. xiv. (Acca) 'took pains to gather together from all parts relics of the blessed Apostles and Martyrs of Christ, and in their honour to set up altars in separate chapels (*distinctis porticibus*) made for this purpose within the walls of the church.' (From Bede, v. 20.) (h)

(Beauty of the Church)

c. xxii. 'Moreover, who could avail to tell of Acca, the bishop, of blessed memory, who still lives by the grace of God, for his magnificent ornaments of gold and silver and precious stones to deck this manifold structure.' (i)

c. iii. 'And he (Wilfrid) adorned the walls, and the capitals of the columns that sustain them, and the arch of the Sanctuary, with designs and images and with many sculptured figures in relief on the stone, and pictures with a pleasing variety of colours and a wonderful charm.' (j)

Sym. Dunelm, *Hist. Regum*,
Rolls Series, 75/2, p. 52.

§ 54. 'And in this convent there are walls adorned with varied colouring and pictures painted, even as the aforementioned bishop Wilfrid provided them. And furthermore the lord Acca, who after Wilfrid bore rule in this house, embellished it with splendid decoration.' (k)

Aelred of Rievaulx, *On the Saints of Hexham*, apud Raine, *Hexham*, I, p. 175, Prologue.

'The most blessed prelate Wilfrid . . . furnished it with walls of squared stone, as you can at this time see, and . . . decorated it copiously with paintings and stone carving.' (l)

(General Character of the Work)

EDDIUS

SYM. DUN, L.C.

c. xxii. 'My humble powers fail to tell of all this in words, how our holy prelate, taught by the divine spirit, planned and carried out all these works; for we have heard it said that there is not any other house on this side of the Alps built in so noble a fashion.' (m)

§ 54. 'The work of this convent excells all other buildings among the people of the Angles, though these are many and in many places, so that to describe them words would fail. But here at Hexham in length and breadth and beauty all is superexcellent.' (n) ¹

¹ The following are the original passages numbered according to the translations given in the text. Passages (a) (c) (m), Eddius, Vita Wilfridi, in *Historians of the Church of York*, Rolls Series, no. 71/1, c. xxii.

Nam in Aegustaldesae . . . domum Domino in honorem Sancti Andreae Apostoli fabrefactam fundavit; cujus profunditatem in terra cum domibus mire politis lapidibus fundatam, et super terram multiplicem domum columnis variis et porticibus multis suffultam, mirabilique longitudine et altitudine

II THE SITE AND BUILDINGS FROM VII ONWARDS

The after history of the buildings of Wilfrid must now be briefly noticed. Finished, adorned and equipped by Acca, these are extolled by Alcuin in a letter written near the end of VIII to bishop Æthelbert of Hexham as ‘pul-

murorum ornatam, et variis liniarum anfractibus viarum, aliquando sursum aliquando deorsum per cochleas circumductam, non est meae parvitatís hoc sermone explicare; quod sanctus pontifex noster, a Spiritu Dei doctus, opera facere excogitavit; neque enim ullam domum aliam citra Alpes montes talem aedificatam audivimus. . . .

Passage (e), Eddius, c. xxxiii.

Ille vero sanctus pontifex noster . . . circumiens loca Sanctorum ad orationem per plures dies, et reliquiarum sanctarum ab electis viris plurimum ad consolationem ecclesiarum Britanniae adeptus, nomina singulorum scribens, quae cujusque Sancti essent reliquiae; multaque alia bona, quae nunc longum est enumerare, ad ornamentum domus Dei more suo lucratus. . . .

Passage (f), Eddius c. lv.

Ille autem . . . cum sociis loca Sanctorum circumiens, moreque suo ab electis viris sanctas reliquias nominatim congregans, aliaque indumenta, purpureaeque et serica, ad ornamenta ecclesiarum lucratus . . . patriam remeavit.

Passage (i), Eddius, c. xxii.

Porro beatæ memoriæ adhuc vivens gratia Dei Acca episcopus, qui magnalia ornamenta hujus multiplicis domus de auro et argento lapidibusque pretiosis . . . quis ad explanandum sufficere potest?

Passages (b) (d) (g) (j), Prior Richard of Hexham, apud Twysden, *Decem Scriptores*, Lond., 1652, l. i, ch. iii, and Raine's *Hexham*, 1, p. 11 f.

Descriptio Hagustaldensis Ecclesiae. Igitur profunditatem ipsius ecclesiae criptis et oratoriis subterraneis, et viarum anfractibus, inferius cum magna industria fundavit. Parietes autem quadratis, et variis, et bene politis columnis suffultos, et tribus tabulatis distinctos immensae longitudinis et altitudinis erexit. Ipsos etiam et capitella columnarum quibus sustentantur, et arcum sanctuarii historiis, et imaginibus, et variis celaturarum figuris ex lapide prominentibus, et picturarum et colorum grata varietate mirabilique decore decoravit. Ipsum quoque corpus ecclesiae appendiciis et porticibus undique circumcinxit, quae miro et inexplicabili artificio per parietes, et cocleas inferius et superius distinxit. In ipsis vero cocleis et super ipsas ascensoria ex lapide et deambulatoria et varios viarum anfractus modo sursum modo deorsum artificiosissime ita machinari fecit, ut innumera hominum multitudo ibi existere, et ipsum corpus ecclesiae

cherrimae habitationes,'¹ and there is no reason to suppose that their glory faded till the great disaster overtook them in 875, though the bishopric was in abeyance from about 820. In the first mentioned year Haldene the Dane sailed up the Tyne with a great fleet setting everywhere the monasteries and churches alight, and filling the land from the eastern sea to the western with fire and slaughter.² Aelred of Rievaulx says of Hexham that everything of wood was committed to the flames,³ and the fact that at the time the monks of Lindisfarne abandoned their monastery and took the body of St Cuthbert away with them into exile shows

circumdare possit cum a nemine tamen infra in eo existentium videri queat.

Oratoria quoque quam plurima, superius et inferius, secretissima et pulcherrima in ipsis porticibus cum maxima diligentia et cautela constituit, in quibus altaria in honore Beatae Dei genetricis semperque Virginis Mariae et Sancti Michaelis archangeli sanctique Johannis Baptistae, et sanctorum Apostolorum, Martyrum, Confessorum atque Virginum cum eorum apparatibus honestissime praeparari fecit. Unde etiam usque hodie quaedam illorum ut turres et propugnacula supereminent. . . .

Passage (h), Prior Richard, i, c. xiv.

(Acca) Dedit namque operam ut, acquisitis undecumque reliquiis beatorum Apostolorum et Martyrum Christi, in veneratione illorum poneret altaria, distinctis porticibus in hoc ipsum intra muros ejusdem ecclesiae. (Cf. Bede, v. 20.)

Passage (k), Sym. Dunelm., *Hist. Reg.*, § 54.

In quo coenobio sunt parietes variis coloribus exornati, et historiae depictae, sicut supradictus Wilfridus episcopus instituit. Verumetiam dominus Acca, qui post ipsum illum locum gubernavit, glorioso compsit ornatu.

Passage (l), Aelred of Rievaulx, apud Raine, *Hexham*, i, 175.

. . . Eam beatissimus praesul Wilfridus, adductis secum ex partibus transmarinis artificibus, miro lapideo tabulatu, ut inpraesentiarum cernitis, renovavit, et . . . picturis et caelaturis multiphariam decoravit. . . .

Passage (n), Sym. Dun., l.c., § 54.

Praecellit opus ipsius coenobii caetera aedificia in gente Anglorum, licet multa sint et inedicibilia in plerisque locis; sed in eo loco longitudines latitudinesque atque pulchritudines excellunt.

¹ Raine, *Hexham*, i, Appendix, p. vi.

² Sym. Dun., *Hist. Dunelm. Eccl.*, lib. ii, ch. vi.

³ Apud Raine, *Hexham*, i, 190.

that in this part of the North claustral life on the old lines must have come to a sudden end. This was evidently the case at Hexham where for more than a century after the Danish destruction there was no regular life, and the establishment was administered by secular priests so that 'the ecclesiastical possessions of the church were passed from father to son, like lay property, till at length they came to be regarded as actually belonging to the family. And thus it came about that when in later years the Archbishop of York established Austin Canons at Hexham they found almost all the property there in the hands of the priest, and were condemned to suffer the extremes of want and penury.'¹ Hexham was at the time closely connected with Durham where the same secularization of the monastic life had taken effect, and priests of Hexham were also officials of the Durham establishment. When in 1083 the Norman bishop, William de St Carileph, determined to re-establish the regular monastic rule, he expelled from the monastery the secular clergy, and forbade the holding of private property by any member of the reformed community. A priest of Hexham named Eilaf was then treasurer at Durham, and he betook himself to Archbishop Thomas of York, asking him, as Aelred tells us,² to grant him the church at Hexham for the sake of rebuilding it (*reaedificandum*). The continuation of the narrative in Aelred is of much interest and significance. Eilaf came to the place, we are told, and found it all desolate, the walls of the church without a roof and the interior overgrown with grass and shrubs. The rains and the winds had blotted out and overthrown till none of the ancient beauty remained. Such was the desolation of the whole district that he and his establishment had to support themselves for two years only by hunting and hawking. '*He set his mind to the renovation of the church, and began this at the eastern*

¹ *A History of Northumberland*, Vol. III, Newcastle, 1896, p. 119.

² *Apud Raine, Hexham*, 191.

*end, where he installed an altar.'*¹ Soon afterwards however death overtook him and 'he left the fruit of his labour to his son.'

This was Eilaf the second, and he gave all his mind and care to the restoration of the church, cutting down the undergrowth and the trees, cleansing the walls, roofing the whole interior with tiles, and when the walling was worked over everywhere inside and out adorning it with its ancient glory of mural paintings. He laid a pavement of squared stones in the eastern part and set up an altar supported on columns, behind which were to be deposed in a seemly shrine the relics of the saints.

Soon after this the constitution at Hexham was changed by the introduction in 1113 of secular canons. These were at first only two in number, and a large part of the property of the church seems still to have remained in the hands of Eilaf II. We are told that he prepared, with his own hands and of wood, for the new comers suitable rooms and offices—*officina religioni convenientia*—but the means of the canons were at first very limited. A little later, under Archbishop Thurstan of York, the establishment was made a regular one of Austin Canons, and the monastic buildings were reconstructed of stone. At the close of his life—he died in 1138—Eilaf repented him of having kept so much of the property to himself and handed it over to the church, which was also largely endowed at the time by the Archbishop.² *In 1154 there was a great translation of relics, and*

¹ The italics are introduced by the present writer in accordance with what was said (p. 151).

² Richard of Hexham, ii, ch. viii f., apud Raine, *Hexham*, i, 54 f.; Aelred of Rievaulx, l.c., p. 190 f. It adds some interest to the story to note that the first of the two Eilafs was son of that sacrist of Durham, Alured or Elfrid Westoue, whose dealings with the body of St Cuthbert are briefly noticed in Vol. v, p. 400, while Eilaf II was the father of Aelred, Abbot of Rievaulx, the author of the *Life of Ninian*, a Hexham man who, as has been seen, furnishes information of much importance about the place.

this would stimulate the generosity of the faithful whose oblations would swell the now rapidly increasing revenues of the establishment. It was possible accordingly at the end of XII to set on foot a great scheme of rebuilding which resulted in the existing choir and transepts of the Priory church. These form an architectural monument in the severe early Gothic manner that is of world-wide repute, and if only they had been vaulted in stone they would have presented one of the finest existing examples of the style. Such lordly undertakings must have affected the whole life of the community and attracted considerable attention from outside, yet it is a fact, surprising as it may be, that our literary authorities make not the smallest reference to it. It is a striking proof of the necessity for caution in attempts to collate literary and monumental evidence. These of course often enough agree, but on the other hand the absence of any literary mention of work even of capital importance need not be regarded as of any special significance. The fact that this extensive work of early XIII does not include the nave is of course a striking one, and must be taken in connection with an important literary notice in the *Chronicle of Lanercost*¹ relating to the year 1296. This was the date of an invasion of the Scots that seems to have been signalized by barbarities that make us blush for human nature. They set fire to churches and 'destroyed' three conventual establishments, one of them being Hexham. 'In the church at Hexham,' writes the Chronicler, 'which saint Wilfrid that famous archpriest of the Lord erected, there were many holy shrines. . . . The basilica itself distinguished by its Roman work stood there dedicated by the agency of the blessed Wilfrid to the honour of the mildest of the Apostles St Andrew, the spiritual patron of the Scots. . . . These

¹ Put together apparently by a Franciscan of Carlisle about the middle of XIV, this Chronicle was published by the Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1839. The reference is to p. 174.

madmen . . . with barbarous savagery destroyed the sacred buildings by fire, and laid violent hands on all the goods of the church that they could find.¹ . . .’ This statement, together with the evidence of the limited extent of the XIII work just referred to which stops W of the transept, certainly implies that at this time Wilfrid’s nave was still standing, but it is equally certain that it does not *prove* it, any more than William of Malmesbury’s statement about Bradford-on-Avon (p. 302) proves that the existing Saxon structure on that site was built in VII by Aldhelm. Statements about buildings in mediaeval writers must be dealt with in a critical spirit but at the same time a spirit of fairness without either conservative or iconoclastic bias. If the accounts of Eddius and Richard cannot be taken merely in the obvious sense that a first superficial reading would put upon them, they are on the other hand not to be rejected off-hand as purely illusory. What has to be done is to confront these accounts with the monumental evidence now available, and to endeavour to arrive at a reasonable theory of the nature and the history of Wilfrid’s notable buildings.

III THE HEXHAM STRUCTURES IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN DISCOVERIES

We are fortunate in being able to begin the monumental study of Wilfrid’s foundation at Hexham with a part of the existing buildings that is certainly of his time and workmanship. The reference is to the crypt, with which must be associated a construction of precisely similar character at Ripon in Yorkshire. At dates between 671 and about 678

¹ In ecclesia vero Augustaldensi, quam inclytus Domini archipraesul exstruxit sanctus Wilfridus, reposita erant scrinia plura. . . . Ipsa vero basilica Romano opere insignita, ad honorem mitissimi apostolorum sancti Andreae ac spiritualis patroni Scotorum, beati Wilfridi ministerio exstitit dedicata. . . . Insani supradicti . . . barbara feritate flammis aedificia sacrata destruentes, res ecclesiasticas repertas rapientes. . . .

the authorities on Wilfrid's life tell us that he was building churches at Ripon and at Hexham, and Eddius uses almost the same expressions about the two works. Passages (a) (c) refer to Hexham, and of Ripon, as was noticed at the end of the last chapter, he tells us that Wilfrid reared and completed there a basilica built of polished stone *from the foundations in the earth* up to the full height.¹ Underground on both these sites we can see to-day structures on the same scale and on closely related plans, while except in Wilfrid's time there has never been any special connection between the places. When we find that these structures agree in style with the types current at that period in Europe generally, and in technique and material, at any rate at Hexham, with the special conditions of Wilfrid's work, we have no difficulty in deciding that we have before us what Eddius saw and described. There are indeed but few Early Christian monuments in Western Europe of which the date can be fixed with a certainty so absolute.

Both at Hexham and at Ripon the crypts are of a kind that occur in simpler forms in Early Christian graveyards on the Continent.² There is in each case an underground chamber, C on the plans, Fig. 68, measuring 12 or 13 ft. by 8 ft., covered with a barrel vault, with niches in the walls where lamps could be placed. Access was gained through antechambers and vestibules, B, B', and these communicated by narrow passages and flights of steps, A, A, with the church above. The antechamber B at Ripon is covered with a half barrel vault and at Hexham with a full barrel vault and in each case there is an opening cut in the vault, marked E, probably for ventilation. That at Ripon

¹ Nam in Hrypis basilicam polito lapide a fundamentis in terra usque ad summum aedificatam, variis columnis et porticibus suffultam, in altum erexit et consummavit. *Vita Wilfridi*, c. xvi.

² Barrel vaulted chambers of the kind, probably of VI, were excavated some time ago in the cemetery of St Matthias at Trier.

measures 2 ft. E to W by 1 ft. 3 in. N to S, and is certainly not suitable for dragging people through, in accordance with a local notion. The vestibules, B', at Hexham are covered with straight-sided vaults, and the passages, A, with flat slabs. At Hexham the stones used in the construction are Roman and many of them bear marks of Roman




FIG. 68, Crypts at Ripon and Hexham.

tooling and manipulation, while some exhibit carved ornaments and inscriptions. At Ripon, where Roman stones were not readily available, the material is expressly cut for the purpose and the technique is sound and workmanlike.

The use of the crypts and of their various parts and their relations with the churches above are not easy to fix.

We may assume that Wilfrid brought the idea of a sub-

terranean chamber approached by passages and stairs originally from Rome, and he would find examples in use in his time in Gaul. The chamber was sepulchral, but if the body laid in it was that of a saint or martyr arrangements would be made for access to it on the part of the faithful, either for holding a memorial service or as a matter of private devotion. Early Christian cemeteries, the best known of which are at Rome, possessed such chambers and means of access, and the graves of martyrs they might enshrine made them places of pious resort. Over a saintly tomb, wherever situated, a church might be built, as was the case with the Vatican basilica of IV, or the church erected in V by Perpetuus over the tomb of St Martin at Tours. Later on, when the old Roman prohibition against burials within a city had lost its force, it was the custom to excavate these chambers and passages at the altar ends of the urban basilicas, so placing them that the altar in the church above was over the hallowed grave, while access was provided for the pious visitant. For his benefit also in some cases the levels were so arranged as to admit of the insertion of a window closed by a grille through which relics could be seen from the church without descent into the actual chamber. This was the idea of the Ripon and Hexham crypts, where the main chamber is large enough not only to hold a sarcophagus and reliquaries but to admit worshippers, and where stairs and passages are carefully planned, while vestibules, B on the plan, would obviate crowding.¹ It must be noted that the S passage of access at Ripon is in its W parts of later date. The breaks shown opposite the letters A, A, indicate where more modern work has at two periods been added. At Hexham the stairs

¹ The Hexham crypt has recently been re-surveyed and carefully described by Mr C. C. Hodges, to whose account and detailed plan the writer desires to express his obligations. See Hodges and Gibson, *Hexham and its Abbey*, Hexham and London, 1919, p. 77 f. The plan of the Hexham crypt, Fig. 68, has been corrected from this survey.

of access A, A, would come up in close proximity to the two W piers of the mediaeval tower, and these in the recent operations have been underpinned, so that the E portions of the passages shown as dotted on the plan, Fig. 68, are now permanently blocked. The two crypts differ in that at Hexham alone there is a staircase, D, giving direct admission from W, while at Ripon there is some indication of an opening into the main chamber at D through which a worshipper in the church could obtain a partial view into the main chamber.

This opening is to E, whereas at Hexham the direct access just mentioned is from W. In each case the opening or the stair would naturally be approached from the nave or the entrance end of the church accessible to the public, and not from the side of the sanctuary, so that it might be argued that Ripon was oriented towards W. It is highly improbable however that there was this difference in orientation between the two churches. The fact that the forms on the plan are all rectangular might be held to indicate square ended rather than apsidal presbyteries, but this would hardly be a safe inference.

In what way these crypts were actually used and the part they played in the life of the establishments are matters of uncertainty. We are informed by Eadmer¹ that Dunstan was buried in the crypt at Canterbury, but the arrangements in the north were different. Wilfrid was buried in the church at Ripon, close to and on the S side of the altar, which shows that his body was not actually enshrined in the crypt.²

Acca might like Wilfrid have been suitably disposed in the crypt, but as a fact he was buried outside in the cemetery. The truth is that much as we hear about the relics of the ecclesiastical worthies of the place the crypt is in this connec-

¹ Quoted by Willis, *Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral*, London, 1845, p. 9 f.

² Bede, *Hist. Eccl.*, v, 19.

tion never mentioned. Aelred of Rievaulx says of Eilaf the elder that when he came to Hexham from Durham 'he thought it unworthy that the sacred remains should be hidden away underground and decided to take them up from the grave mound (tumulo) and place them with due honour in a chest covered with a fitting pall behind the great altar.'¹ It would perhaps be rash to interpret the 'locus inferior' as the crypt, but these passages about the relics show that even if enshrined there in honour they would not have been sufficiently in evidence to suit the hagiolatry of the mediaeval ecclesiastic, and Wilfrid's crypts may have soon passed into oblivion, though there are traces in that of Hexham of mediaeval use. This crypt is now clean, dry, well-lighted, and accessible, in a condition very different from that it was in before the recent operations, and the certainty about its date and authorship combine with its intrinsic worth to make it one of the most interesting bits of Early Christian construction in NW Europe.

No complex archaeological questions are connected with the crypt, but these meet us at once when we continue investigations on the interesting ancient site, and the following paragraphs are designed to give a very succinct but as far as possible a clear account of these somewhat involved Hexham problems.

The three sketch-plans shown,² Figs. 69, 70, and 71, are only aids to the reading of the text and must not be taken as offering the exact measurements not really now available and in any case only possible on a scale larger than this volume allows. Fig. 69 gives the Priory Church in its present

¹ 'Indigne autem ferens sacras reliquias loco inferiori obrutas, placuit ei eas evulsas tumulo digno honore retro altare majus in theca operto pallio honestius reponere.' Raine, *Hexham*, I, 191.

² These are based on the small plan given in *A Record*, etc., Hexham, 1907, Pl. xxviii, and thanks are hereby tendered to the Rev. Canon Savage and Mr C. C. Hodges, joint authors of the work, as well as to the proprietors of *The Hexham Courant*, for the kind permission granted for the use of this plan.

finished condition, but till 1907 it only consisted in the superb choir and transepts and, as Fig. 70 shows, the space W of these, proved by the presence of the crypt to be the site of Wilfrid's nave, was an open grassy yard with a sort of pit in it at A giving access by the W passage to the crypt. To S the space was bounded by a wall of XIV or XV date and at the W end of it was a conglomeration of ancient and more or less modern structures while portions of the Priory

SKETCH PLAN HEXHAM ABBEY CHURCH

TO SHOW EXTENSION AND REARRANGEMENT




FIG. 69, Hexham Priory Church as re-constituted after 1907. (No scale.)

buildings of later mediaeval date stood as they stand now, partly modernized, to S and SW of the open space. The portion of walling lettered B is an abutment for the NW crossing pier and marks the line of an arcade the W respond of which is seen at D projecting from the W wall terminating the open space.

In the course of the recent operations resulting in the new nave, the open space and parts adjacent to it were dug over and explored, but it must always be remembered that

there has been no systematic turning over of the whole ground,¹ as for instance the area of the present transepts, over which Wilfrid's structures may possibly have extended, and the various finds, which have not been strictly co-ordinated nor classified according to their levels, are not always interpreted in the same way by different observers. In all the operations of about 1907 onwards Mr C. C. Hodges, who had made his mark long ago as the Hexham authority par excellence,² was intimately concerned, and in his plans and notebooks as well as in his memory there exists a mass of material that he has been unfortunately precluded by ill-health from working up into a clearly defined form. Mr Hodges, from whom in old times the present writer has learned much and received very valuable information, has kindly communicated to the latter tracings made by him from the plans recording the recent discoveries, and from these as well as from the reports of the late Mr J. P. Gibson, Mr John Gibson, Junr., and experts actually engaged on the excavations, a suggested general plan of Wilfrid's church is offered in Fig. 71.

It must be said at once that as a confirmation of the accounts given as above by Eddius and the XII writers the result of these operations was disappointing in the extreme. Portions of what are or may fairly be claimed to be the handiwork of Wilfrid's builders, over and above the crypt, came to light and are marked on Fig. 71 C, C¹, etc., but they exhibit it must be confessed little or nothing of the special features signalized in the documents (a) to (d). In respect of the W parts of the Saxon church the finds confirm or at any rate do not contradict what we learn from the documents, that the church was basilican with columns between nave and aisles (c) (d), and the 'arch of the Sanctuary' (j) can be accepted without difficulty, but when we come to the E and

¹ That is, with archaeological intent. The whole of the ground in the transepts has been tumbled about and honeycombed for heating apparatus.

² *The Abbey of St. Andrew, Hexham*, by C. C. Hodges, Priv. Prin. 1888.

more important portions it is disappointing to find that the numerous separate side-structures or porticus, the turrets for stairs, the oratories that Prior Richard compares to propugnacula (g), and in general the multiplicity of parts of which we form a mental picture as we read Eddius and Prior Richard, have distinctly failed to materialize. A review of the passages in the light of what is here noted becomes of course necessary and will be essayed in the sequel. As regards the actual discoveries a mere record of what has been seen or is reported would supply little more than a miscellaneous collection of facts in which no system is apparent, and it is essential that these should be brought into relation with some hypothesis for which they may seem to furnish a satisfactory groundwork.

The hypothesis that has been adopted here is that Wilfrid's church was planned on the scheme of some of the more important Roman basilicas of IV to VI with which he would have become familiar, wherein a broad free space in the form of a transept is interposed between the E termination of the nave and aisles and the apse, producing what is called the T or Tau plan. This plan makes no appearance among the Early Christian basilicas at Ravenna or in N Africa but was used at Rome and seems to have occurred also in Merovingian Gaul.¹ In our own country the scheme was adopted in the apparently non-basilican church at Peterborough, a remarkable monument of imposing size the dating of which is unfortunately doubtful. The foundations of this came to light about 1883 under the crossing and adjacent parts of the present Norman edifice. Fig. 72 gives the plan, which it will be seen presents transepts of great length and spaciousness and a comparatively narrow presbytery that must have ended square. The space from N to S across the great

¹ 'En Gaule, il semble que les églises munies d'un transept aient été assez communes depuis le VI^e siècle,' de Lasteyrie, *Architecture Religieuse*, etc., Paris, 1912, p. 88.




FIG. 72, Foundations of E part of Saxon abbey church at Peterborough.

open rectangle of the transepts was 92 ft., but the length of the nave is unknown. There are no transeptal arches and no possibility of a central tower but the scheme exhibits a lordliness and simplicity that accords well with the spirit of a good building epoch. As we have just seen the plan would suit an early date, and we should be disposed to see in it the work of the early builders of Medeshamstede in the latter half of VII. The influence of Wilfrid (p. 105) has been invoked to explain the ambitious scale of the scheme. The remains are accessible from the present church and we owe a careful description of them to the competent pen of Mr J. T. Irvine, who was Clerk of Works to the Cathedral body.¹ The plan shows the result of the investigations carried on in 1883 in connection with underpinning operations for the piers of the Norman central tower. Within the space enclosed by the Saxon walls, that are 2 ft. 8 in. thick and are preserved for about three courses of the masonry, there was found the original plaster flooring of the Saxon church and the remarkable fact was established that the great Norman piers and sleeper walls 'were merely begun *on the surface of the Saxon plaster flooring*, which, though sunk down and crushed by the enormous weight, yet so remained that its crushed surface could be washed to find whether painting or incising had existed, neither of which appeared. . . . Under none of the four pillars was any sort of foundation stone found.' The practical compliment thus paid by the lordly Norman builders to the excellent technique of the Saxon plasterer is well worthy of record.

A careful examination of the Saxon masonry revealed a fact bearing on the question of its date. 'Re-used stones from a former church were seen present in the walls of both transepts,'² and the N wall of the transept 'was discovered to have been built out of the remains of still older Saxon

¹ *Ass.*, 1884, p. 278; and *Ass.*, I, 1894, p. 45.

² *Ass.*, I, p. 53.

buildings.' Some of the stones of the wall below the floor line yet retained on them traces of hard grey Saxon plaster applied to them when they formed part of an earlier building. The quality of this plaster Irvine praises. This extensive re-use of the materials of an older structure makes it very hazardous to assume that we have here the remains of the church of Wilfrid's day contemporary with the foundation of the great Mercian monastery in the latter part of VII. It is quite possible however that we have here an early rebuilding, on the same plan but on an extended scale, of the original edifice with which Wilfrid may have had some connection. The case would be similar to that of St Peter-on-the Wall, Essex, where Cedd's original church may have been rebuilt after a short existence in more solid and ample fashion. The remains are however none the less notable for their scale and for the example of the 'crux commissa' plan which they exhibit, and their existence gives a certain support to the hypothesis here offered as to the church at Hexham.

Noting now the discoveries of old work as indicated in the suggested plan of Wilfrid's church, Fig. 71, we will see how they fit in with the proposed scheme. Saxon walling, paving, and foundations belonging in some cases almost certainly to Wilfrid's time are marked C, C¹, etc., on the plan and may be taken here in their order. (1) Over the SE passage and stair of access to the crypt the pavement of the early church was found at a level only a little above the upper surface of the covering stones of these. This pavement has in part been left exposed, and is indicated by the letter C. (2) At the W end of the open space, clearing and excavation brought to light broken sections of masonry of different dates forming portions of a W wall. At the S part of this wall there is a patch of masonry of Roman stones at a height of 5 or 6 ft. from the ground and with later stonework beneath it, that looks like part of an early wall, and may quite probably be a relic of Wilfrid's church. The mediaeval

wall in which it is embedded has a narrow passage way in its thickness, and this enables the inner as well as the outer face of this masonry of Roman stones to be seen and its thickness to be measured. This is about 2 ft. 6 in. It is marked on the plan C¹. (3) A continuous wall, some 70 ft. at least in length, preserved for two or three courses above its foundations and about 2 ft. 8 in. in thickness was found to run E from near the N extremity of the broken masonry of the W end till about 25 ft. W of the W wall of the N transept of mediaeval date. This stretch of walling had outside it to N a number of early burials probably in many cases of Anglo-Saxon date, and this may well have represented the N wall of the N aisle of Wilfrid's nave. This stretch of walling, C², upon which is now reared the N wall of the modern nave, seemed to the writer to present all the appearance of an early Saxon well-built thin wall, and this, with the masonry of Roman stones in the W wall, has been coloured black in the plan and accepted here as of VII date. The rest of the plan is indicated by open lines and is frankly conjectural save in certain portions where foundations were laid bare that may have carried early Saxon walling. It must be repeated that other foundations seem to have made their appearance beside those of which account is here taken and there is a great deal here that is necessarily hypothetical. At C³ on the plan Mr Hodges reports a line of foundations that seem to correspond with the assumed position of a S wall of the S aisle of the basilican church,¹ but indications in the S part are not nearly so clear or well attested as they are to N. If the N and S limits of Wilfrid's building were as here given the total interior width of the basilica would be some 60 or 70 ft. The N and S arcades are indicated by two rows of columns, that to N being on the line of the present arcade between nave and N aisle. On this line Mr Hodges indicates old patches of foundation, but these seem

¹ *Record*, etc., p. 40.

too far apart to be brought into connection with Wilfrid's row of columns. The S arcade is purely conjectural.

(4) Passing eastwards we come to two lines of foundation running N and S that have been adopted here as a basis, though it must be confessed a slender one, for the transeptal plan here adopted. That to N, C⁴, was laid down distinctly by Mr Hodges as forming a right angle with the stretch of walling C², but he does not bring it down towards S.¹ The more southerly foundations, C⁵, are not given by Mr Hodges but their existence was attested by other competent observers on the spot, and they seem to have run northwards to the vicinity of the crypt thus indicating the W wall of the transept up to where would come the Arch of Triumph between nave and transept, perhaps the 'arch of the Sanctuary' of passage (j). The length of the transept as well as its width from W to E and the span of the apse are conjectural but are made here respectively about 100 ft. and 24 ft.

(5) C⁶ marks an important but rather enigmatical discovery. Just within the mediaeval choir there were laid open in May 1908 the lower courses of an apparently pre-Norman apse, outside and to E of which were several stone coffins and bases for memorial crosses. The walling, which is now accessible by a trap door in the floor of the choir, is two or three courses in height and about 2 ft. 6 in. thick, and is composed of comparatively small squared stones 12 or 15 in. long and 9 in. high. The work has no distinctive Norman character and is neatly put together, but the apse is small and not above 14 or 15 ft. in internal diameter. The distance from the centre of its curve to the E limit of the main chamber of the crypt is about 57 ft., and the whole distance from this same point in the apse to the inner face of the patch of masonry of Roman stones in the W wall is about 150 ft. This may be claimed as representing the complete internal length of Wilfrid's basilica, but

¹ *Hexham and its Abbey*, p. 42; *Record*, p. 39.

only on the assumption that it is Wilfrid's apse. This is however extremely doubtful, and for two reasons. One reason is its exiguous proportions which do not correspond to the lordly style of building with which the wealthy and ambitious Northumbrian is naturally associated, and the other and more cogent reason is its distance from the crypt, that according to all analogy cannot be separated so far from the sanctuary. The same consideration rules out from the scheme here adopted a line of foundations running N and S along a considerable part of the present S transept, and marked in the sketch-plan C7. This line has been known for a long time,¹ and at one place in it was found in 1881 used as building material the fine Roman memorial stone, 8 ft. 8 in. high, with the relief of a standard bearer, which is now preserved in the transept. This foundation, which was said to run the whole length of the S transept, has been invoked as evidence for a T shaped E end but any transept of which it marked one of the longitudinal limits would be, like the apse just mentioned, too far from the crypt. In the scheme suggested in Fig. 71 the main chamber of the crypt comes within the limits of the transept but is not under the apse, that is, not under what would be the usual position of the chief altar in an Early Christian basilica. In the church on the Plan of St Gall however, of early IX date, the chief altar was not in the apse but in a presbyterial prolongation of the sanctuary that answers to the transept on our plan, and St Gall can be claimed as justifying the arrangement here shown.

On the much-discussed question What became of Wilfrid's church there is only space for a sentence or two. When the present choir and transepts were erected during XIII there must have been an older nave standing, as the Basse Œuvre stands at Beauvais, limiting for the time being the later more advanced operations. This nave must either have been

¹ *Record*, p. 47.

Wilfrid's, damaged but still in use, or an early Norman rebuilding, for which there is definite though materially slight monumental evidence in the Early Norman W respond of the N arcade of the nave marked D in Fig. 70. If, as Mr John Bilson believes, this represent (1) a nave built by the first generation of Austin Canons the completion of which was signalized by the translation of relics we read of in 1154 (p. 158), then Prior Richard must have written about Wilfrid's church with this Norman rebuilding before his eyes, and this may account for a certain Norman colour about his descriptions. If on the other hand (2) the respond be regarded as the first beginning of a projected Early Norman nave never carried out, it may be put down to the early Austin Canons or even to the Eilafs. We are told however of Eilaf 1 (p. 157) that he began his 're-edification' at the E end, and it is quite possible that we have his work in the small apse, C⁶, which has been placed in the plan outside the limits of Wilfrid's church. It is of course much more likely that rebuilding would be begun at the E rather than the W end of a ruined structure, and it is difficult on this second theory to account for the W respond. Whether the nave that was standing in 1296 was Saxon or Early Norman we must suppose that it was destroyed by the Scots and the site left exposed till our own time.¹

We return now to the question posed above, that of the co-ordination of the literary and the monumental evidence for Wilfrid's church. To the former additions might be made, as for instance by the quotation of the flamboyant passage in praise of Wilfrid's monument in W of Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum*, l. iii, § 117, but such passages were written about other early churches, and William was a south-countryman and was only repeating and magnifying Northum-

¹ The latest sketch of Hexham ecclesiastical history is by Mr John Gibson, F.S.A., in the Diamond Jubilee issue of *The Hexham Courant*, August 2, 1924. He thinks that there was never a Norman nave.

brian glorification of its chief early architectural treasure. This glorification however has its significance as evidence of the impression made by Wilfrid's work, and it is unscientific to disregard this impression as if it was a mere hallucination. Wilfrid it may be repeated was a very wealthy and very ambitious man eager for great things, and he was working at the top of his form in the great period of Northumbrian art marked by the Gospels of Lindisfarne and the Ruthwell and Bewcastle crosses. The artistic importance of these cannot be denied for they are still in existence and are their own evidence. Wilfrid's work is not here to speak for itself, and may be depreciated on the grounds (1) that it is not likely to have been nearly so fine as public rumour made it, and (2) that history discountenances its pretensions because it did not lead to anything. This last objection appeals to the student whose interest is purely in architecture as a progressive art developing from period to period, and who cannot believe that the Saxon architecture of the period after Wilfrid can have been so unpretending if he had set a brilliant example. But in Saxon architecture as in Saxon culture generally, owing partly to the national character and partly to the historical accident of the Viking ravages, promising things did not fulfil anticipations, and cultural phenomena are rather sporadic and unconnected. Hence Wilfrid's achievement must be judged independently, as is attempted here, without bias and in a spirit of detachment.


Three impressions derived from the passages must be tested in this spirit, (1) that the building had more than one story; (2) that the structure was multiform in the sense that chapels or oratories or stair turrets were built out from the main structure; and (3) that the walls were honey-combed with passages and stairways. The first impression we must hold to be justified. There can be little real doubt that over the aisles of Wilfrid's nave there were galleries, or tribunes, or, as the Germans say, Emporen. Eddius speaks

distinctly of upper and lower stories, Prior Richard of 'tres tabulatus,' and the 'solaria' mentioned in the descriptive verses on York (p. 147) prove the same for that VIII building¹ with the earlier history of which Wilfrid was connected. This detail about Hexham and York is of considerable significance and will be returned to (p. 179). In the case of (2) and (3) we start with the fact that taken at its face value Eddius's description suggests something like a late mediaeval building, such as St Giles, Edinburgh, made multiform by the assembling of aisles and chapels grouped around the main edifice, and Prior Richard's an internally complicated fabric like the Early Norman W front of Lincoln, within which there is a maze of narrow passages and stairways. The latter impression is rather dissipated by the character of the wall, C², Fig. 71, which is comparatively thin with no room in it for passages and stairways, features that do not occur in Saxon buildings as we know them, and which the normal Saxon wall would not accommodate. To this it may be answered that galleries necessarily imply stairways, and these must have existed in Wilfrid's church, though no monumental evidence for them has come to light. The absence of monumental evidence is accordingly, it may be argued, not conclusive against the existence of built-out porticus, for such may conceivably have projected, say from the E wall of a transept such as we have imagined, though the diggers on the site of the new nave a few years ago did not light on any trace of them.

This argument may in fairness be reinforced by reminding the reader that built-out porticus of the kind, mostly but not always on a small scale, actually existed in Britain in Wilfrid's time at Canterbury and perhaps also at St Peter-on-the-Wall. Moreover outbuildings which have entirely disappeared were grouped round the western ends of early churches such as Monkwearmouth. Importance is not however attached

¹ So Dehio and von Bezold, 1, 282.

here to these considerations because it is believed by the writer that the look of complexity which seems to have impressed Eddius may have been due to the subdivision by 'cancelli' and partitions of the ample interior spaces of the building, so as to establish a number of separate chapels or oratories for the reception of Wilfrid's numerous altars, and to render any 'building-out' unnecessary. As a fact, fragments of sculptured slabs still to be seen in the church have been signalized and put together on paper by Professor Lethaby and others as remains of such cancelli, and Mr W. G. Collingwood has it is understood in preparation a work on the numerous relics of Hexham sculpture, some of which may have belonged to Wilfrid's church. The limits of space preclude any notice here of such fittings or decorations [passages (i) (j) (k)], though the famous pontifical chair,



From "The Builder," April 1st, 1899.

FIG. 73, Ancient pontifical chair at Hexham.

really a part of the architecture of the church, must have a word. This is figured, by the kind permission of the proprietors of *The Builder*, in Fig. 73 in a position that shows the ornament on the top, the triquetra in which is just like what is found on the tail of the serpent round the Escomb dial noticed Vol. v, p. 174. This attests the early date of the chair, in which Acca or even

Wilfrid may have sat, and gives it an exceptional position, like that of the Deerhurst font (p. 211), among pieces of church fitting that are claimed on more or less convincing grounds as Saxon. It has of course been considerably

knocked about and then repaired, and all sorts of sanctuary associations have become attached to it, but it has been placed at E in Fig. 71 in what is believed here to have been its original position. Passages (h) and (g) favour subdivision by cancelli, for though the latter passage in the words 'ut turres et propugnacula supereminent' suggests separate out-buildings yet 'oratoria superius et inferius' means 'in the galleries as well as on the ground floor,' and we visualize internal arrangements. Passage (h) is as a fact taken from Bede and being practically contemporary really settles the question, for it states that Acca placed 'altaria, distinctis porticibus in hoc ipsum *intra muros ejusdem ecclesiae.*' Acca was probably only following Wilfrid's example in keeping 'within the walls.'

The really important architectural point that emerges as certain from these somewhat hypothetical discussions concerns the galleries. In adopting these Wilfrid was not exactly an innovator, but he had the wit to seize on and exploit forms and arrangements that were beginning to come in in his day, and that were destined to have an important influence on the later development of the art. He certainly noted at Rome all that was being done to modify the plain form of the Early Christian basilica. This was originally devoid of galleries. When in the Constantinian epoch the aisleless churches of the latter part of III were doubled in ground area by borrowing the aisles of the civil basilica,¹ the galleries which always surmounted these were not at the same time taken over by the Christian builders. A reason for this suggests itself. From what we hear of the uses of the civil basilicas we derive the idea that these galleries were the haunt of the flâneurs and loafers of the community, who watched idly from above the business which went on in the thronged nave and aisles on the ground floor. The galleries would accordingly carry with them social traditions of a rather

¹ As for example in the case of S. Saba on the Aventine.

frivolous kind, and the Christians may have been averse for this reason from their adoption, while they would be glad of the free wall spaces for their paintings and mosaics. Galleries were however very useful for the purpose of subdividing the congregation, a notion which attracted the ecclesiastical authorities of the day,¹ and were employed in the East for the segregation of the women of the congregation from the men. They were also used both in the West and the East in the central or domed churches like S. Lorenzo at Milan or S. Vitale which though rare were conspicuous for their fine architectural qualities. The gallery at S. Vitale was the matroneum or gynaceum, and the well known historical mosaic shows Theodora and her ladies about to ascend to it.

The convenience of the gallery must have appealed to the churchmen at Rome for though it makes no appearance in the Ravenna basilicas and hardly elsewhere it was being introduced at Rome itself sufficiently early for Wilfrid to have seized the notion and retained it in his mind for future use. If the dates in Rivoira² may be accepted, when Wilfrid visited Rome he may have seen galleries already added to the basilicas of S. Lorenzo Fuori, SS. Quattro Coronati, and S. Agnese, and he deserves all credit for his prompt adoption of the scheme. The earlier innovation of the transept, also practically confined to Rome, we have assigned to him also, though only as a plausible conjecture. Both the transept and the gallery are of the highest importance in connection with the future development of Western architecture, the former in the case of the plan the latter in that of the internal elevation.³ In Saxon England the transept plays its part

¹ There is a striking illustration of this in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, II, 57, in Anti-Nicene Library, xvii.

² *Lombardic Architecture*, Eng. Trans., I, 183.

³ Later on galleries, besides their value as elements in the architectural composition of the side elevations of church interiors, became of great use as places for the disposal of subsidiary altars (p. 183).

as will be seen in the sequel, but it is remarkable though characteristically Saxon that Wilfrid's galleries produced little or no effect, and save at Deerhurst there seems hardly a trace of them in existing Saxon buildings. This is not however the fault of the ardent Northumbrian.

Another architectural idea brought back by Wilfrid from Italy materialized at a later period of his life at Hexham. This was the idea of the 'central' church on a circular or polygonal plan where a middle space is surrounded with concentric or radiating adjuncts often in two stories. The central space and the galleries may be covered with a wooden roof, in which case the building has no more constructive interest than the basilica, but the examples that have real architectural importance are practically always vaulted over all their spaces, and possess great aesthetic charm as well as constructive value. One of the finest is S. Lorenzo at Milan, probably of the end of IV but reconstructed in XVI on the Early Christian lines, and this Wilfrid will certainly have seen on his peregrinations. S. Vitale at Ravenna, that inspired the Minster at Aachen and through this many churches of the West (p. 237), he may not have visited, but such buildings would appeal to one possessed of the architectural sense, and that Wilfrid had been attracted by them is proved by his erection at Hexham of a church on the 'central' plan dedicated to St Mary. This may be numbered XIX. It stood SE of the basilica, but it passed out of existence at an early date, destroyed Aelred says by the Danes, and was rebuilt in the mediaeval period on a rectangular scheme. Fragments of this reconstructed building in the Pointed style still exist among the houses S of the Hexham market place, behind the so-called Shambles. What it was like as Wilfrid planned it we hear from Prior Richard, who calls it a marvellous work with its main building rising in the semblance of a tower and in shape almost round (Aelred says 'opere rotundo') and having on the four sides as many

side-structures (porticus).¹ This has been explained as a building on the Greek cross scheme, like the sepulchral chapel of Galla Placidia at Ravenna, but the expression 'fere rotunda' suggesting an octagon would not be suitable in that connection, and we must probably imagine something that on a smaller scale would recall S. Vitale or S. Lorenzo at Milan, or, as it would not be vaulted, a simpler structure like the Dome of the Rock at Jerusalem. The architectural fashion set in this way by Wilfrid was actually followed by his successors for we hear of at least two central churches in Saxon England, one built by Alfred the Great at Athelney (p. 196) and the other at St Augustine, Canterbury, by its last Saxon abbot but one, Wulfric (p. 87).

Returning to the question of the separate oratories, we may ask whether such arrangements for the disposal of subsidiary altars, so common in later mediaeval times, existed in Wilfrid's day in the continental countries through which he had passed. The date at which chapels of the kind first came into use is discussed in the recently published first volume of the monumental work on the Christian altar by the learned Father Braun S.J.,² but without any definite results. The example he quotes as early, from S. Maria Antiqua at Rome, does not hold, for the space there flanking the presbytery and forming a separate chapel was not built as an oratory, but was used first as a prothesis or vestry, and did not receive its altar before VIII, that is to say, after Wilfrid's time.³ The evidence collected by Father Braun seems to show that for a long time after the multiplication of altars began in the early part of VI these were placed in the

¹ '(Ecclesia) mirandi operis, et ipsa scilicet in modum turris erecta et fere rotunda, a quatuor partibus totidem porticus habens, in honorem Sanctae Mariae semper virginis dedicata.' Raine, *Hexham*, I, 14.

² *Der Christliche Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, München, 1924, I, p. 368 f.

³ G. M'N. Rushforth on S. Maria Antiqua in *Papers of the British School at Rome*, Vol. I, Lond., 1902.

churches themselves, and we see them on the Plan of St Gall, seventeen in number, standing out in the nave aisles and transept, not in separate 'Anbauten' or porticus, and this is an additional argument in favour of the view taken in the text (p. 178).

If the limits of space allowed, a good deal could be said on the ecclesiological aspect of Wilfrid's collection and disposal of the relics of the saints. Passages (e) and (f) describe the former and (g) and (h) the latter process, (e) exhibiting to us the professional Roman relic-monger exploiting in his capacity of 'electus vir' the wealthy and pious Anglo-Saxon, and (g) the triumphant enshrinement of the treasures in the latter's Northumbrian home. It all represents an early stage in the development of a phase of mediaeval church life of quite transcendent importance. The cultus of relics is indeed a predominant factor in the evolution of the complex ecclesiastical structures of the later middle age from the simple Early Christian basilica. To put it briefly, relics meant altars, and altars required fitting positions and surroundings, and to secure these, and at the same time to leave the main alleys free for processions and circulation, spaces were screened off, apses and chapels thrown out, and galleries reared over aisles,¹ involving considerable changes in planning and construction. Relics thus honoured attracted the devotion of the faithful, and this devotion expressed itself in offerings left by pious pilgrims at the shrine. These offerings accumulated and provided means for the extension and embellishment of churches. The cultus of relics gave mediaeval architects much to do and at the same time provided means for achieving the desired ends. When to-day in wonder and delight the eye roams over the magnificent architectural display at the sanctuary ends of Canterbury or Durham or Gloucester, one must remember that the shrines of Becket,

¹ Galleries of X in St Pantaleon at Cologne show the niches where subsidiary altars were placed. Dehio and von Bezold, I, 206.

Cuthbert, and Edward were the lodestars that drew towards the fane those countless thousands of pilgrims whose offerings made possible the prodigious outlay involved.

At St Augustine it has been seen (p. 91 f.) how shrines and subsidiary altars would be disposed in an English church of the end of VI and beginning of VII. The burials were those of local worthies only and were to be permanent. All was simple and domestic. Within three quarters of a century the interior atmosphere of a church of the kind was becoming changed by the importation of exotic treasures. An altar containing feathers from the wing of the archangel Michael or drops of congealed blood from the neck of John the Baptist does not greatly appeal to the most pious modern mind, but we may all be thankful for the opportunity such shrines offered to the constructive and decorative artist, and those to whom early mediaeval ornamental work represents the perfection of style will be grateful to Wilfrid for his multiplication of church fittings.

CHAPTER VII

SOME POSSIBLE EIGHTH OR EARLY NINTH CENTURY CHURCHES

WITH THE exception of St Peter-on-the-Wall, Stone-by-Faversham, Escomb, and Corbridge, all the buildings hitherto discussed can be located on fairly satisfactory evidence at different dates in VII,¹ and the other four carry marked indications of a similarly early origin, that is, an origin if not definitely in VII at any rate in the early part of VIII, let us say in the lifetime of Bede, who died in 735. When we pass to the last half of VIII and again from VIII to IX we are confronted with the fact that there are no existing buildings which can be ascribed with any certainty to these centuries. During IX the Viking invasions may have hindered the building of churches, and in the North, about 875, there was considerable destruction of those that already existed, but before these incursions began, there was certainly an opportunity for carrying on the architectural work that showed such promise in the century before.

As regards Northumbria, the centre of activity in the last quarter of VII, the new period was one of decline. The death of Wilfrid in 709 'brings to an end the interesting period of Northumbrian history. The northern kingdom from this time onwards is of little account and its story one long record of faction and decay.'² An exception must be made as regards one important field of culture, and that is learning. Largely through the influence and example of

¹ York of course comes into VIII.

² *The Cambridge Mediaeval History*, Camb., 1911 etc., II, 562.

Bede there was founded and maintained through VIII the school of York, from which proceeded Alcuin, who under Charles the Great organized and inspired the Carolingian schools. It is noteworthy that York carried on also the Northumbrian tradition of architecture, and its cathedral of the middle of VIII, though only known from literary records, is the one building of the century of outstanding interest and importance. It has already been discussed (p. 147).

While however Northumbria declined there were other kingdoms to take its place. If the southern group of early churches of VII belong to the kingdom of Kent which under Æthelbert was the leading state in Britain, if the northern group make their appearance at the time and place of the practical supremacy of Northumbria under the rule of Oswy, we should expect to find a similar architectural development in the kingdom of Mercia, which under Wulfhere, 659-675, had limited the power of Northumbria and now 'for the whole of the eighth century . . . clearly holds the headship of England.'¹ Mercia proper, the seat of the power of Penda and Wulfhere, lies in the western midlands between the Derbyshire hills and the Cotswolds, and judging from analogy we should expect to find this Mercia of Æthelbald, 716-757, and Offa, 757-796, represented by a considerable monumental output, but while there may have been much architectural activity of which we have no details in connection with the great Mercian abbeys such as Evesham, the only important west Mercian site where monumental remains of the period may be extant is Repton, near Burton-on-Trent. This was the seat of an early religious foundation, which in VIII had been constituted a burial place for the Mercian kings. Æthelbald and others of the line were there interred. At Repton there is now a Saxon church of importance with a crypt, and in the lower part of this crypt there is work that possibly belongs to the earlier epoch of the building (p. 318).

¹ *Cambridge Mediaeval History*, loc. cit.

Even in the smaller churches this part of Mercia is not rich, as a glance at the chart of sites at the end of this volume will show. Offa was not only one of the outstanding figures of Anglo-Saxon history but was a liberal patron of the Church. He founded the great monastery of St Albans in 793, and erected, W. of Malmesbury says, a 'basilica pulcherrimi operis,'¹ but no remains of what he built have survived. His religious capital was Lichfield which he was powerful enough to erect into an archbishopric to supersede in his dominions the authority of Canterbury. This arrangement lasted only for sixteen years but is significant of Offa's resources and position. At Lichfield, in VII, its first bishop, the saintly Chad, had been content with a humble oratory, probably of wood, but one of his successors, bishop Headda, 691-c.721, who in company with the Abbess of Repton comes into the interesting story of Guthlac of Croyland, built there a stone church of some pretensions; we know however nothing about either this work or any extensions or alterations that may have been due to Æthelbald or Offa.

The eastern portions of Mercia centering in Northamptonshire are more prolific in Saxon architectural remains than the western, but after the early Brixworth and perhaps Peterborough (p. 168) the outstanding monuments such as Barnack, Brigstock, Earls Barton, and Wing all exhibit details that belong to the Third Period, and there is nothing that seems to remind us of the early group. Allowing therefore for the possibility that some of the examples of our VII group may really have been built in VIII, we have to regard VIII in respect of monuments as a comparatively barren region, but it is possible provisionally to assign to it a couple of buildings that have no distinctly late features and yet in some of their details hardly accord with the work of the earliest group.

The most obvious of these is Heysham Chapel, on Morecambe Bay, Lancashire, the ground plan of which was given

¹ *Gesta Pontificum*, Rolls Series, no. 52, p. 316.

Fig. 21. This is traditionally dedicated to St Patrick, and though it is a long way to Ireland Heysham is now a starting place for the voyage to that country, and the suggestion of an Irish connection for the little building may with some reason be based on its apparently Celtic form and the projection from it, at the base of the E gable on the N side, of a *πρόκροστος* or corbel stone of Irish appearance. These arguments for an Irish origin are however more than out-balanced by the specifically Saxon construction of the single




FIG. 74. A, B, gable ornaments, A, Irish, B, at Heysham Chapel, C, capital at Deerhurst.

narrow S doorway, the jambs of which have the 'Escomb' form. It is true that in some of the early Irish stone buildings we find a more or less accidental resemblance to this fashion of setting stones in a jamb, see for example Fig. 23, but it is never purposeful as in Saxon work, and the Heysham chapel is almost certainly Saxon, though it shows Celtic influence in plan and details. The chapel stands in a ruined condition on a rocky table a few yards W of the parish church of Heysham itself in part of Saxon date, and the curious graveyard connected with it was referred to in Vol. I, p. 311 and Fig. 25.¹ It exhibits great length in proportion to its

¹ A pre-Conquest date has been claimed for the graves hollowed in the rock to the west of the chapel, on the supposition that some marks on the flat stone to the north of the northernmost of the cavities are the remains of an ornamental pattern of interlaced work similar to that on pre-Conquest stone

width, a Saxon feature, the internal dimensions being about 27 ft. in length by a width that varies from nearly 9 ft. to less than 8 ft. The wall is about 2 ft. 5 in. thick. There is no trace of an altar and no sign of a window in the E gable which is well preserved, but the marks of one are visible in the S wall, and enough of the jambs has been left to show that it was internally splayed. The curious projecting stone at the base of the E gable on the N side, Fig. 74, B, may be compared with the Irish stone of similar form shown with it in Fig. 74, A, as suggesting Celtic associations.

The S doorway shown in Fig. 75, A, may be paralleled by the similar feature, well preserved though blocked, in the N wall of the church at Somerford Keynes in Wiltshire, Fig. 75, B. In both cases the stones in the jambs are arranged in the alternating scheme of upright and flat, while the head is cut out of a single stone and ornamented with three bands concentric with the opening, but, whereas in the Chapel these are sunk flutings, at Somerford Keynes they are cable mouldings in relief. The latter doorway has imposts cut into a step pattern which is quite a Saxon detail. It measures 8 ft. 4 in. in height by a width narrowing from 2 ft. 6 in. to 2 ft. 4 in. The jambs therefore slope. The doorway of the Chapel has no imposts, resembling in this the Irish chancel arch in Fig. 23, and this same peculiarity occurs in the old N doorway of the Parish Church a few yards away that was discovered hidden by a buttress when the new N aisle was added in 1864. This doorway, the head of which is cut out of three single stones one behind the other, has the jambs composed Escomb-fashion of long flat stones alternating with upright slabs, one of which, 9 in. thick, is 3 ft. high by a width of 2 ft. 5 in., the thickness of the wall. The old W door of the church has similar features, and the jambs in both cases are upright.

crosses. As a fact these are only pick marks made when the surface of the stone was dressed flat. Marks exactly similar can be seen on the walls of the square sinkings where the head-stones stood.

It seems clear that the original nave is of Saxon date. It measures about 30 ft. by 15 ft. 6 in., and as there are none of the later features visible the date may very well be early. The well known collection of pre-Conquest carved stones in




FIG. 75, Doorways, A, at Heysham Chapel, B, at Somerford Keynes.

the churchyard gives the place early associations. It is to be noted that the doorways have the early feature of a rebate, Fig. 21, but this may perhaps have been cut later.

Heysham Chapel and Church and Somerford Keynes may therefore be assigned conjecturally to the latter part of

VIII. The grounds for this ascription have just been given. They are the absence on the one hand of specially Roman features, except the treatment of the jambs which is chronologically valueless as it occurs in very late Saxon buildings as well as early ones ; and on the other hand of the characteristic later features that as we shall see were introduced from the Continent during the later Viking period. They both lie in the W, the former in the NW part of the country, where the earliest Saxon work is not to be looked for, and this is an additional reason for the intermediate date.

The question will naturally be asked whether there are not other examples up and down the country which may on the same grounds be located in this period, the latter part of VIII or perhaps the first part of IX.

Sockburn-on-Tees, in a loop of the river a few miles S of Darlington ; Bardsey in the old Elmet Forest district N of Leeds ; possibly Titchfield, Hants, and, more doubtfully, Bishopstone, near Seaford, Sussex, illustrate what has just been said, and possess both positive and negative claims to inclusion in the present group, though the ascription to VIII is necessarily only conjectural.

Sockburn, an interesting fragment, was published by C. C. Hodges in *The Reliquary* for April, 1894. It has characteristic thin Saxon walling a part of which was shown in Fig. 40, and exhibits none of the later features or details. The walls were of the great proportionate height of 25 ft., a little more than the internal length of the nave. No door or window openings survive. Mr Hodges thought it early and compared it with Escomb, pointing to the use of Roman stones for the quoins.

At Bardsey, Fig. 76, can be recognized an Early Saxon nave-and-chancel church with a W porch embedded on all sides but W in later mediaeval structures. A tall slender tower now surmounts the porch on the walls of which it seems to have been built, as was the case at Monkwearmouth

and at Titchfield, Hants. The upper part of the tower is of Saxon workmanship and retains on S two stories of Late-Saxon mid-wall work in double openings, but the W quoins of this upper part are quite different from the quoins of what will have been the porch below. The latter are in big stones, the former quite ordinary, and this fact coupled with the appearance, in itself not marked enough to be conclusive, of the marks of an old gable on the W face similar to that at





FIG. 76, Saxon porch and W end of nave, Bardsey, Yorks.

Monkwearmouth, bears out what is said above. A remarkable feature of the building is the thinness of the walls, which in the porch and nave are only a bare 2 ft. or 2 ft. 1 in. in thickness. A tower 50 ft. high rests on these thin walls, and its walls are 2 ft. thick at the lower of the two stages with the double openings, but are reduced to c. 1 ft. 8 in. at the uppermost story. As

bearing upon the W porch theory which has been adopted here it is to be noted that in the ground plan the porch or lowest stage of the tower measures from W to E 10 ft. 2½ in. but from N to S only 8 ft., which are of course the proportions of a porch rather than of a tower. The difficulty in the porch theory is that there is no W door, the only entrance having been to N where there is a low r. h. doorway only 2 ft. 6 in. in width. Above, in the N and S walls, about 8 ft. above the ground, are small r. h. windows with sloping jambs splayed slightly internally. The later N and S aisles, apparently Norman in their first origin, were carried so far to W as to be flush with the W wall of the porch or tower, as at Deerhurst, and in this way the lower part of the tower is masked save to W, where it shows its original external width of 12 ft. The N doorway is not rebated.

Enough has probably been said to show that the building






FIG. 77, View of Bishopstone Church, Sussex, from the south-west, showing the Saxon porch and Norman western tower.

is one of considerable interest, and the absence of late features, save in the upper stages of the tower, coupled with the form of the openings and the great thinness of the walls, makes an early date in the Saxon period a very plausible hypothesis. The original nave seems to have measured about 31 ft. 1 in. by 15 ft. 8 in.

The subject of towers built on the walls of earlier porches may have here a word. This was certainly the case at Monkwearmouth, Corbridge, and also Titchfield, Hants, and can be assumed with full confidence in the case of Brixworth. Documentary evidence makes it clear that the arrangement existed at Christ Church Canterbury (p. 77). The case of Bardsey is only a little less certain. It does not however follow that, if a tower measure on its ground story more in the direction in which the church is entered than in the other, it was originally a porch, for there are W towers, as for example Ledsham, Middleton by Pickering, and Wharram-le-Street, in Yorkshire ; and Bosham, Sussex, all measuring more W to E than N to S and yet there is no suspicion that they are built on earlier porches.

Bishopstone, near Seaford, Sussex, Figs. 77, 78, presents the most imposing of Saxon lateral porches on the S side of a partly Saxon church with a fine Norman W tower and Norman or later E portions. There is also a little Norman secondary porch applied in front of the doorway into the large Saxon porticus which has on the façade of it above the little Norman gable a Saxon sundial with the usual octaval divisions and an inscribed name EADRIC. The height of the gable of the main porch is 21 ft. and the interior space measures 12 ft. 5 in. N to S by 9 ft. 2 in. E to W. The door into the church, altered in the jambs, is not in the centre of the N wall of the porch but on the W side so as to leave the E part of the porch interior free, no doubt for the accommodation of an altar and those performing their devotions at it. We are reminded of the lateral S porch at Christ Church, Canterbury (p. 77),

with its altar of St Gregory, and the same arrangement is suggested as we shall see at Bradford-on-Avon¹ (p. 302). There




FIG. 78, Bishopstone, Sussex,
S porch and W end of nave.

are no openings with details to define the date, but the walls are only a little over 2 ft. thick and the S quoins are worked with fine pillar-shaped big stones, three of which are nearly 4 ft. 6 in. high. The S and N walls of the nave are Saxon, and the Norman tower is built up against the Saxon W wall, the doorway in which has been altered. The nave lights are internally splayed. There is a largeness of character about the work that, coupled with the absence of any of the later features, makes an early date plausible, but

the big stone quoins introduce a grave element of doubt. At Titchfield on the other hand nothing of the kind is present to forbid us from postulating a date even as early as the period we are now dealing with, for the masonry of the porch above which has been added a tower, and of the W wall of the church where there is a use of Roman bricks, may be quite early, and as was pointed out (p. 66) the springing of the W arch is in very primitive technique.

Part of Wroxeter Church, Salop, within the Roman city of Viroconium and built of Roman stones, has been claimed as early, but on this see (p. 488).

¹ Mr O. H. Leney, in an article on the church in *The Antiquary* for Oct. 1911, suggests that the porch may have accommodated a font instead of an altar, and have served as a baptistry. He believes that the sundial, which is cut in a slab of Caen stone, is an insertion of a time near the Conquest.

CHAPTER VIII

THE VIKING AGE

THE NINTH century with the first half of X was the age of the earlier Viking inroads with all the political and social disturbance they brought in their train. What was the effect, we may ask, of the influx of the Northmen on Anglo-Saxon art? All over the country and more especially in the North the pagan sea-rovers destroyed and damaged churches, and the desolation they wrought in Northumbria has been already referred to in connection with Hexham (p. 156) and Brixworth (p. 113). Taking the country as a whole however it would be a mistake to postulate a complete break in the building operations that had gone on so actively in the earlier period. Churches were repaired and new churches were built. For example, William of Malmesbury says that the church of St Peter built at that place by Aldhelm had twice been burned by the Danes, in the time of Alfred and in that of Edward the Elder, but he says at the same time that the building had lasted intact (*illibata*) to his own day, and he praises it in terms similar to those he used about Hexham (p. 175).¹ Of Swithun of Winchester we learn that he was 'a diligent builder of churches in places where there were none before, and a repairer of those that had been destroyed or ruined,'² and W. of Malmesbury writes of his going about the country to consecrate churches.³ It is noteworthy moreover, and even startling, to see that St Swithun's episcopal activity from 852 to his death in 862

¹ *Gesta Pont.*, pp. 363, 361.

² *Acta Sanct.*, July 1, 291.

³ *Gesta Pont.*, p. 161.

coincides with about the worst period of Viking raids and devastation that southern England ever knew. After the Pact of Wedmore in 878, Alfred secured nearly fifteen years of peace for his kingdom, and amongst his operations in favour of the Church, apart from his New Minster at Winchester, he built two convents one at Shaftesbury for nuns and the other for men at Athelney. The church here is described as small, but was striking in its form showing that there was plenty of life in the architecture of the time. Asser, § 81, speaks of Alfred's buildings as grander and more costly than the older ones through his own new contrivances, 'nova sua machinatione.' This Athelney church was put together, we are told, in a new method of building, for there were four piers, 'postes,' planted in the earth to uphold the whole structure, and four aisles with rounded ends on the four sides of it.¹ If accordingly good building still went on during the period, though under difficult conditions, we may inquire whether in its forms and methods it was influenced by Viking practice. Were Alfred's 'new contrivances,' for instance, based on Norse patterns introduced by the Scandinavian invaders who from 878 had settled down as his neighbours?

A distinction must here be drawn between the arts of decoration and those of construction. In the former the Northmen were highly exercised, and in one branch of them, ornamental carving in relief, Norse influence in England was almost at once effective, so that in the last part of IX Viking motives make an unmistakable appearance on the carved stones of sepulchral use in the North, the Midlands, and the West of England, as well as on portable objects of various kinds.² There is direct Norse influence too on our 'penny'

¹ *Gesta Pont.*, 199. 'Quattuor enim postes solo infixi totam suspendunt machinam, quattuor cancellis opere spherico in circuitu ductis.'

² This has been clearly brought out by Dr Brøndsted of Copenhagen in a recent article of great value, entitled 'Nordisk og Fremmed Ornamentik i Vikingetiden,' in *Aarboeger for Nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie*, Kjøbenhavn, 1920, p. 162 f.

coinage, to be noticed in a subsequent volume, while the particular types of weapon favoured by the sea-rovers come markedly into view in the 'finds' belonging to the period.

In the constructive arts the case is different. The Northmen brought with them no traditions of stone construction that could affect our native builders, and it is a question whether their timber building would be markedly different from that of the Anglo-Saxons. They certainly knew how to put together beautiful clinker-built ships, upon which they might on occasion, as on the Oseberg royal yacht at Christiania, lavish carved ornament of wondrous complexity and charm. Such ornament too would no doubt make its appearance on their wooden houses, as it does conspicuously on their churches of a later time, but in IX the structure of the house may still have been quite simple. About the Scandinavian houses of this period we know little, for the representation of Valhalla on the Ardre and other figured stones at Stockholm is of no help, and the notices of chieftains' houses in the Icelandic sagas are of later date. It is of course possible that the shipbuilding in which the Vikings were so expert may have influenced their house construction in the direction of the rather advanced methods of the wooden churches, or 'Stavkyrker' of Norway. Highly interesting as these may be they are decidedly not 'primitive.' As a rule they are basilican in plan with nave and aisles, were very often apsidal, and in such features as round-arched arcading and cubical capitals exhibit a direct imitation in wood of Romanesque stone forms. Naturally there were none of these Norse churches till the sea-rovers had suffered conversion, and existing examples are much later than the early Viking age, but the technique of them may have been traditional. They are braced together ingeniously, and the planking clothes a skeleton that may be compared with the keel and ribs of a ship. Such a technique, used of course not for the non-existent churches but for houses, may have

been imported by the sea-rovers into Britain and have influenced the timber construction of the Anglo-Saxons. We are here however in the domain of conjecture, and all that we actually know is that the only piece of Anglo-Saxon wood building that has come down to us, the nave of Greenstead church in Essex, is subsequent to IX but is still of the most primitive kind, while the wooden forts of the Normans shown at a subsequent date on the Bayeux Tapestry are of the same simple 'block-house' order.

It is necessary here to take note of the opinion recently expressed in a very influential quarter in favour of the old view that wood technique is clearly reflected in some of our later Anglo-Saxon buildings. The reference is to Prof. Josef Strzygowski's work on Early Christian Art in which he refers to the tower at Earls Barton as showing us 'the wooden prototype translated into stone.'¹ The view that the vertical stone strips in evidence there as on so many later Saxon structures are copies of the upright wooden beams characteristic of our well-known 'half-timber' building is a very attractive one, but it has been rejected in the present work for two reasons. One is that half-timber work represents a comparatively late technique belonging to a time when wood was getting scarce and had to be used economically as a framing to be filled in with the cheaper materials, wattle and clay, plaster, or brick; whereas in early Saxon days in this country as in Scandinavia timber was plentiful enough to be employed in the block-house fashion, where there is no need for framing; the other is that the Anglo-Saxon pilaster strips are really stone forms derived from the German Lisenen, which are themselves drawn from the familiar Roman pilasters of classical tradition.

It is possible however that the Viking inroads may have affected our native work in an indirect manner, and certain features in Anglo-Saxon building may find here their explana-

¹ *Origin of Christian Church Art*, Oxford, 1923, p. 234.

tion. It will be useful to refer here to Ireland, a part of Christian Europe to which the pagan sea-rovers devoted their closest attention. Irish architecture developed a special form of defence against an attack that, if not in some way countered, would have involved the pillage and destruction of practically all the religious establishments of the island. The round tower, a constant feature from about X of the ancient Irish monastery, was devised as a place of refuge for the possessions and personnel of the institution, that could not be rushed, and was strong enough to resist any but a leisurely and well organized assault. The round tower of massive stonework, with its only door of access raised many feet above the ground, to which the monks had fled with all their silver vessels and other property, though the Viking crew might prowl about it, would be too hard a nut for them to crack without giving more time to it than suited their ways. They were a restless impatient set like big school-boys, and would probably curse the monks by Thor and Odin and sweep on after other prey. No Irish round towers survive from the earliest Viking period, but those that remain are no doubt survivors of a first generation constructed rudely and in haste. Ease of construction under these conditions may have conditioned the round form of plan, but this is of course in a military sense scientifically correct, as it presents no corners that can be effectively attacked by a battering ram.

It has naturally been suggested that the round church towers of East Anglia, a region of England specially obnoxious to Viking attacks, had a defensive or protective purpose similar to that of the Irish towers. A like suggestion has been made in respect of the numerous W towers of Lincolnshire, where the Danes were likewise very busy. These are square in plan, and as is also the case with the E Anglian towers, are in most cases late, and largely of Norman date with marked Saxon survivals. They may of course like the

existing Irish round towers represent an earlier set that had some military significance, and it must not be forgotten that as in France,¹ so in the Border districts of the English North, a military character attaches to some square W towers of churches. The existing Anglo-Saxon towers do not in their present aspect and details suggest any purpose of this kind. About half of them have W doorways to the exterior on the ground level, and as a rule they have open tower arches sometimes of imposing dimensions giving free access to and from the church. The opening is on the other hand sometimes only a doorway, that is however in general not rebated on the jambs for a door. There is an exceptional arrangement at Leathley near Otley in Wharfedale, Yorkshire, where between tower and church there is only a doorway 3 ft. 4 in. wide closed with an iron-bound door, the sill of which is 3 ft. above the floor of the church. Leathley has no distinctive Anglo-Saxon features, and the same applies to the Northumbrian example of Edlingham, near Alnwick, that has been claimed as Anglian but is obviously of Early Norman date. Here there is a narrow doorway between tower and church with sinkings in the jambs for a wooden bar. These sinkings however are close to the inner face of the opening, that is the face nearest the tower, so that the bar would only defend the door from being forced in the direction *from the tower to the church*, and would not protect the ingress into the tower. The tower accordingly cannot have military significance. Billingham, Durham, which like Edlingham has no W tower opening, has a narrow doorway about 2 ft. 9 in. wide to the church but this had no door except a slight one hung across the opening on the tower side (p. 30). If the upper stories of these towers had been used as places of refuge, an enemy could always have gained access to the ground story through the church, and as this ground story was not vaulted he could have burned or smoked out the

¹ De Lasteyrie, *Architecture Religieuse*, 388.

refugees in the upper stages. Hence it cannot be said that existing Anglo-Saxon towers appear in any way directly to reflect the conditions of the Danish wars.

Apart from the towers, a question of interest is the possible influence of these conditions on the form, openings, and details of the church itself. It was noticed on an earlier page (p. 132) that there is one marked feature of Saxon churches that occurs early but cannot readily be derived from either Roman or Celtic prototypes. This is the great proportionate height of the nave walls, and to this may be added the small windows placed at a considerable elevation in these walls, a peculiarity that occurs fairly early. This same height of walls is observable in many of the early French churches, now reckoned post-Carolingian, noticed on a previous page (p. 132).

To understand this question we must form an idea to ourselves of the probable outward conditions of these Viking forays. Henry of Huntingdon, in a rhetorical passage suggested by Job i, describes the hopeless embarrassment of the Saxon ruler who was inundated by messengers, hard on each other's heels, bringing news of the ravages of Viking bands, north, south, east and west of his domains. The mobility of the raiders was as great on land as on sea and they could give points to the Ministry of Transport in the matter of getting quickly about the country. The Saxon Chronicle tells us repeatedly that the army of the heathen men 'took horse' and careered from side to side of the island, though it is a mystery where they procured the beasts since horses were not largely employed by the Saxons either for agriculture or war. The movements were rapid, the forces loosely organized and discipline lax, so that small bands of avid adventurers might split from the main body and engage in hasty private rapine to right or left of the line of march. Accustomed as they were to timber structures, the use of blazing torches for the firing of these would be familiar to

them,¹ and a quick method of destruction was to throw such a missile up to a thatched or shingled roof, or get it in through an accessible window opening. To carry up the walls to a considerable elevation and to make the windows small and set them high was an obvious counter stroke, and it would be natural to explain in this fashion the architectural features of Saxon churches above referred to. The great difficulty here is Monkwearmouth, which presents these features in combination with others that seem to require a pre-Danish date. We cannot dissociate the porch with its barrel vault and its Roman and other early features from the nave walls which on the present showing should be later by a century and a half. If the nave with its lofty proportions and its small high windows show the influence of the Viking inroads, then it may fairly be argued that the porch is equally late. If nave and porch be equally early, then what has just been said loses its force, and high walls are not necessarily conditioned by defence. The French writers do not seem to have taken up this point when dealing with the early Gallic churches, though the question whether these are Merovingian or post-Carolingian in date is clearly connected therewith.

There is a curious and much discussed detail in the chancel at Jarrow, Durham, that must here have a word. There are two ranges of windows in the side walls, the uppermost wider and now built up, the lower narrower, and the relation between the two sets is not easy to fix. The point however is that the outer apertures of the small lower windows on S have been closed in with slabs of stone in each of which has been pierced a small opening a few inches across. It has been suggested that this was done in Saxon days in order to utilize some small irregularly shaped bits of window glass of which the monastery has become possessed. This seems

¹ In the reliefs on the Antonine column the Romans are seen firing with blazing torches the wooden palisades and huts of the barbarians.

rather far fetched. Another view is that the apertures were reduced in this way in the Danish period so that prowling raiders might not be able to throw their blazing torches into the building. The arrangement is illustrated in Fig. 79.

It was said above that Viking influence on English work showed itself early and in a marked manner in decoration, especially upon the carved stones. It is natural to inquire if there are cases where carved stones, the ornament on which can be located in this intermediate period, are found in situ




FIG. 79, Windows in chancel wall, Jarrow.

as architectural enrichment of early churches.¹ If these stones exhibited Viking motives we could assume that the church was built by or under the influence of the northern immigrants, and might look for traces of that influence in the architecture. The chief examples of such carved fragments, used constructively, and of a date that can be assigned with some confidence to this intermediate period, are to be found at Hackness and Kirby Hill, Yorkshire; Deerhurst, Gloster; and Britford, Wilts. It is only however

¹ Only stones in situ, or obviously once part of an existing church, have architectural significance for this purpose. Mere fragments that seem to have formed part of churches which have left no other remains, such as those noted by Mr Collingwood in the *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, xix, p. 276, xxiii, p. 287, are of no help to us here.

at Deerhurst that the constructive detail bears any Viking character. It must be said at once that this Viking character, if it be such, is confined to the decoration, and that there are no Scandinavian features to be discerned in the architecture of the Severnside building.

Hackness, near Scarborough, has an Anglo-Saxon nave, about 30 ft. by 18 ft., with walls 2 ft. thick, pierced with later arcades, above which on S there are the remains of an original window.¹ The chancel arch is in the thin wall, and the voussoirs are through-stones while the jambs are evidently planned Escomb-fashion, though there seems to have been a good deal of reconstruction. Both impostes are unchamfered and are in the main old but only that on the N jamb is carved, and this applies solely to its S face where a panel measuring 28 in. by 6 in. is ornamented in low relief with a motive of elongated and interlacing birds. It is given from a drawing by the writer in Fig. 80, 1, and it will be seen closely to resemble one of the sides of the fragmentary shaft at Spofforth near Weatherly, Fig. 80, 2, which Mr Collingwood assigns to the period transitional between pure Anglian and Danish work.² In both, animals'—at Hackness certainly birds'—heads are attached by long necks to the degenerate remains of bodies. An almost equally close parallel is furnished by a quite datable piece in another material, in the form of a coin of Offa of Mercia 757-799, on which is a decorative panel containing two confronted birds with very degenerate anatomy, Fig. 80, 3. This would put Hackness quite early, and as none of the original Saxon work in the church shows any of the later details belonging to the Third Period, C, presently to be noticed, it may be set down to IX, and indeed there seems really nothing to prevent its being as early as the date of the great Anglian cross, magnificent even in its fragments, that makes the chief interest of the place.

¹ Mr John Bilson, F.S.A., in *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 1924, p. 406.

² *ibid.*, xxiii, 1915, p. 240.

At Kirby Hill, near Boroughbridge, we are on fairly firm ground. Here within the later S porch at the E side of the present Norman S door into the church there remain in the wall some stones of an older S door apparently of wider span, which carry a fine carved impost happily preserved for good portions of its S and W faces. The S face has well designed and executed *entrelacs*, while in W there is a charming little bit of good Anglian vine scroll, which fully justifies Mr Collingwood's ascription of the carving to the pre-Danish period of IX,¹ and this date would in consequence stand for the Saxon church of which these stones are survivals. It is




FIG. 80, Hackness impost and pieces for comparison.

probable that the fabric of the nave generally is of the period thus indicated. Its walls where they are preserved are about 2 ft. 6 in. thick, and there are no Third Period details.

The very important church at Deerhurst on the Severn between Tewkesbury and Gloucester, presently to be examined, exhibits details that are of distinctly Scandinavian character, while there are no marked features belonging to Period III. Projecting heads of animals carved in stone make their appearance as enrichments on the exterior, or internally as corbels from which hood mouldings or similar features are made to start. Such projecting heads are familiar to students of early Greek art under the name *πρόκροσσοι*. They must

¹ *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, xix, 338, with a drawing.

be distinguished from the projecting stones, not zoomorphic in shape, which occur at the external corners of old Irish oratories, and a specimen of which in this country occurs at Heysham, Fig. 74, B, and also from the heads of animals, often bears, and of men, that in Norman art are found in rows as corbel-like supports to cornices. The *πρόκροσσοι* spoken of above are different from the former through their animal character, and from the latter in their sudden and seemingly accidental bursting out as single features with a purely decorative intent. When used as corbels or consoles under hood moulds they are of course more normal. Such projecting animals' heads are familiar in northern decorative art, as on the extremities of Norwegian cruciform fibulae, and we find them also in wood carved at the ends of projecting beams on the exteriors of the wooden Stavkyrker of Norway. The same heads carved in stone make their appear-





FIG. 81, Projecting head at Deerhurst.

ance on English sepulchral monuments of the middle and later Saxon periods, as on the ends of the so-called hog-back tombstones common in northern Britain, and similar *πρόκροσσοι* are prominent features at Deerhurst. Fig. 81 is a sketch of one over the W door, and another, inside the W porch, is seen at 1 in Fig. 82. These heads are no doubt of Viking importation, and the zooform *πρόκροσσος* may well have been introduced into England as a consequence of the Danish or Norse invasions, and on the principle of dating here followed we may regard

its appearance as an early indication, as it would be more likely to be used soon after its introduction than at a later time.







FIG. 82, 1, Head from Deerhurst. 2, Ornament at Britford.

Britford, just outside Salisbury, supplies carved detail of a very interesting kind in the form of vine scrolls of a type common in the North, but rare in the S Midlands and unknown in Kent and the S counties. The ornament is on slabs that line the soffit face of an arched opening in the N wall, the purpose of which, with its relation to the edifice generally, will have to be considered later on (p. 220 f.). There are two upright slabs about 4 ft. 6 in. high by 9 in. wide, occupying the outer thirds of the E face of the jamb with between them two square stone slabs similarly enriched set at intervals with a space between them and spaces above and below. Fig. 82, 2, shows one of the square slabs and a portion of the adjacent upright, giving an adequate view of the decorative pattern. The square has a complicated interlacing pattern not easily reduced to order, the work on the upright slabs is however quite clear and intelligible. How far, we may ask, is it datable? The motive is obviously the vine scroll familiar from the examples on the Bewcastle and Ruthwell crosses, but without the introduction of animals (Vol. v, ch. x). It is highly conventionalized and quite dull and lifeless when compared with the early work of VII or early VIII, at Otley, Yorks., or Simonburn, Northumberland; on the two great crosses; and on other monuments of the 'Hexham school.' Such work was most naturalistic and at its best in the latter part of VII, and before the Norman Conquest it had gone away to nothing. Now the Britford work is not a mere aimless scribble but firm and even rigid in design; with the trumpet-shaped sheaths at the branchings accentuated; the bunches of grapes made prominent; and contour lines, which come in with the Danish influence, strongly marked. There is no sign of the later acanthus foliage nor of other XI motives, and the early part of X would be a reasonable date whereto to ascribe it. The architecture of the building, where it exhibits details, agrees with this, as will be seen in the sequel, and Britford may fairly be

claimed as a monument of the intermediate or Danish period.

At Hackness and Kirby Hill there is nothing now of architectural interest, and the original Saxon churches were probably of the simple nave-and-rectangular-chancel type of which the fashion was set by the earlier Escomb. At the other two places we find monuments of some pretension, that possess to the full the elements of interest which Saxon architecture affords, the interest, that is, which belongs to work of a certain rude strength, bristling with elements that are quaint and abnormal and often intriguing through the uncertainty of their purpose and use.

The examples of Deerhurst and Britford are of sufficient importance to justify a description and they are treated here as belonging rather to the latter part of Period II, than to the Third Period when the new features already referred to make their appearance.

The plan of Deerhurst,¹ Fig. 83, includes a square or, rather, oblong W tower, a nave flanked at the E end by projecting chapels or side chambers and terminated by an apse, and the church is crowded with features of interest. There was an early monastic foundation at Deerhurst but of the building of the monastery and its church there is no record, and the fabric itself contains the only evidence of its date. The W tower with walling 2 ft. 8 in. thick below but thinner above is 71 ft. in height but the uppermost portion is mediaeval. The material is ragstone rubble and there is no special treatment of the quoins. Here as in other parts of the church walls there are patches of herring-bone work. There are no sets-off or string courses to break the uniform surfaces of the masonry, and in this the tower contrasts markedly with the half-hundred later W towers that characterize Period III,

¹ Deerhurst was described in a monograph by the Rev. G. Butterworth, *Deerhurst, a Parish of the Vale of Gloucester*, Tewkesbury, William North, 2nd Ed., 1890, from which the writer has derived much assistance.




FIG. 83, Plan of Deerhurst Church showing Saxon features.

where there is nearly always a set-off. The plan shows the tower markedly oblong in section, the external measurements at the base being 21 ft. 6 in. from E to W and only 14 ft. 6 in. from N to S, which gives the tower when seen from W a look of remarkable height and slenderness. It batters as it rises for the E to W measurements taken at the present top of the tower are 20 ft. 6 in. The view given in Fig. 84 makes this apparent. There was an original r. h. W door altered now to a pointed form and above this projects one of the fanciful animal's heads spoken of above as a Scandinavian feature, Fig. 81. Higher up there was a similar detail, and another at the E end of the church. Some of these *πρόκορσοι* on the building have however been mutilated. There are numerous openings that correspond with the somewhat elaborate internal arrangements of the tower that now require notice.

The main entrance to the church for the public from outside, as distinct from the members of the monkish community, was through the archways from W to E. These are three in number and they are singularly low and narrow when compared with the ample and, especially, lofty tower arches which are features of the later Saxon W towers. The width and height of the largest, the eastermost, are only 5 ft. 8 in. by 10 ft. respectively, and the other two are of lesser dimensions. Over the middle arch is an interesting sculptured figure in relief (p. 450). Other openings in the tower as well as those in the church generally are often flat headed but are also completed by normal or by straight sided arches. The jambs of the openings often slope. There is no recessing, and no mouldings in the case of any of the arches, but half-round shafts are used on the soffits of those of more importance. Hood moulds square in section are very commonly employed. It may be noted that some of these tower openings are doorways and are cut straight through the walls, while those that are windows are only slightly




FIG. 84, Deerhurst Church from SW.

(To face p. 210.)

splayed, and are never double splayed like so many Third Period lights. Internally on the ground story the tower space is cut in two by a transverse wall running N and S nearer to the W entrance door than to that leading E into the nave. This partition wall is carried up to about a third of the height of the tower. The side walls of the tower E of it, shown as solid on the plan, have been at a later time pierced with arches giving direct access to the mediaeval side aisles, that now flank the nave and are carried westwards so far as to be flush with the W wall of the tower. In a sort of baptistry formed by this W extension of the N aisle there is now located the famous Deerhurst font which stands alone among British fonts as being at once unmistakably Saxon and of the highest intrinsic interest and beauty. A font of course is not part of the fabric of a church and cannot be relied on as evidence for its date, but in this case it must be contemporary with the building. Any abbey church of Deerhurst that preceded this existing one must have been very slight or it would not have been so entirely superseded at an early date, whereas the font is of great importance and would hardly have been made for a slight building. The font as a whole has been so often figured that it is very well known, but it has never been properly published and any notice of it as a whole would involve a consideration of the enriched base on which the bowl stands. For the present purpose which is chronological the bowl itself is all that is needed and this is shown on a fairly large scale in Fig. 85. The most severe anti-Saxon could hardly be contemptuous of this imposing piece, and no one could call the spiral ornament in it Norman or locate it generally in that vaguely defined but convenient region the twelfth century. The chief point of interest for the present purpose is not the spiral ornament which everybody knows, but the two bands of enrichment above and below which are obviously of the same date. This is scroll ornament of the vine character

with sheaths at the bifurcations and conventionalized bunches of grapes in the form of rosettes. The special attention of the reader is craved for this ornament in its connection with the vine ornament on the Britford jamb, Fig. 82, and the three carved slabs from Barnack, Fig. 115. The spiral ornament at Deerhurst would suit this middle Saxon period and certainly could not well be later than IX or X. Spirals of this very 'Celtic' kind are very rare in Anglo-Saxon stone carving, but an example occurs at South Kyme in Lincolnshire, where a fragment noticed long ago by Bishop Forrest Browne has recently been brought into prominence in the *Antiquaries Journal* for April 1923. The motive is of course common in MSS. and metal work of the Hiberno-Saxon school. The scroll work is closely paralleled on the carved slab at Kirkdale, Yorks., once known as 'King Ethelwald's grave stone,' a work of the pre-Danish period. On the whole the font furnishes valuable evidence for the date here ascribed to Deerhurst Church.

The upper stories of the tower were internally only accessible by ladders, but there existed both on the W and the E faces doorways by which communication could be maintained with the exterior. The E wall of the tower as seen internally from the nave shows at a height of 16 ft. above the floor a r. h. doorway, now blocked, with markedly sloping jambs. It is placed N of the central line and is accompanied a little S of this line by a curious triangular opening cut straight through the wall with sides about 1 ft. 6 in. long. It is a curious fact that there are two similar apertures in the original side walls of the nave above the later arcades that must of course have given on to the open air, unless, as Mr Micklethwaite suggested,¹ there were originally side aisles to the nave which may have had over them attics from which these triangular openings could be put to use. Their practical purpose is hard to discern, but the one on the E wall of the

¹ *Arch. Journ.*, LIII, 349.



FIG. 85, Bowl of Deerhurst font.

(To face p. 212.)

tower by the side of the doorway was clearly meant to afford a view into the church to a denizen of the chamber to which access was gained through this doorway. How this last was connected with the nave of the church we may divine from the appearance on the W wall of the nave (the E wall of the tower) at a level a little below the threshold of the door, of some projecting stones that may have supported a wooden gallery accessible by the door or by a stair from the floor of the nave. This watching chamber, as we seem justified in calling it, was lighted by apertures in its N and S walls, and communicated by a door in the partition wall of the tower noticed above with a similar smaller W chamber lighted by a square headed aperture in the W wall of the tower.

The story above these chambers was probably undivided, for it is thought that the partition wall stopped at the floor of it, and it was evidently an apartment of considerable dignity. It was furnished with two aumbry-like recesses in the N and S walls, about 2 ft. in height by a width of 1 ft. 6 in., and was lighted by slightly splayed windows in the same walls measuring roughly 3 ft. by 2 ft. In its W wall it has a doorway to the open air 6 ft. high by 2 ft. 6 in. wide very carefully constructed, and presenting on the exterior a r. h. opening handsomely framed above by a square headed hood mould starting from projecting animals' heads. Above there was a *πρόκροστος* like the one over the entrance doorway below. What this upper doorway gave upon is hard to say, for it was some 30 ft. above the ground and there is no sign of any gallery or staging connected with it. Some adjunct there may have existed built out from or up against the W wall of the tower, and the possibility of this has to be considered in connection with other Saxon towers and their adjuncts, where this same question arises (pp. 329 f., 337 f.).

The most important feature of this upper chamber is the opening from it towards the nave. This takes the shape of a double aperture the form and details of which are of

much significance and are shown in Fig. 86. It must be noted that the pier which divides the aperture, including cap and base c. 3 ft. 6 in. high, runs through almost the whole thickness of the wall and is not a mid-wall shaft. Furthermore it is enriched with flutings, that are alternately in their upper or lower halves filled in with convex members in the fashion called 'cabling,' while all the details are cut with




FIG. 86, Opening in W wall of nave, Deerhurst.

classic decision. The drawing, Fig. 86, is made from the inner face of the opening, the exterior not being easily accessible. On the exterior face the two side pilasters are fluted as well as the central one which is enriched on all its sides. Notice the form of the caps with what look like thin slabs superimposed (p. 280f.), and the hollow chamfer on the bases—a detail also found in other parts of the building.

No such treatment of double openings and no enrichment

of the same pattern occurs elsewhere in our Saxon work,¹ and we may single out the feature in question as one of the very few in any Saxon building that can be distinctly fixed as transitional between the First and the Third of our periods. We find certain forms in evidence in the earliest groups and others in vogue in the latest period, but we have already seen how hard it is to find any link of connection between the two sets. This case of the subdivision of an opening by means that are not yet those of the normal mid-wall shaft and through-stone, is accordingly of especial significance for the chronology of Saxon work. A case not wholly unlike at Earls Barton will be noticed later (p. 287). In another connection the character of the detail has equal significance. Carolingian art supplies us here with somewhat close parallels. On the W face of the N half-round flanking turret of the W fore-building at Aachen occurs a small opening, divided by a square fluted pilaster, that can be distinguished in Fig. 91. Similar pilasters, that are modern restorations, divide openings in Carolingian walling that abuts on the NW corner of the minster, and fluting of the same classical pattern occurs elsewhere in Carolingian work. Some capitals from the palace of that period at Ingelheim, in the Museum at Mainz, show it, and so do certain imposts in the church at Höchst on the Main, placed by Essenwein in IX.² The 'Thorhalle' at Lorsch in its upper stage, Fig. 96, also furnishes an instructive parallel. Above the opening on the side facing the nave there is inserted a stone slab, about 3 ft. by 2 ft. 6 in., as if for an inscription. It is however now entirely blank.

The interest of the tower interior is not yet exhausted, for there are signs of its use at a level as high as that of the present roof of the nave. The side walls and roof of the Saxon nave were higher than they are at present. The top of the original S wall has left its mark at the present SE

¹ The reeded pilasters at Bradford-on-Avon are much coarser attempts.

² *Handbuch der Architectur*, die Baustile, III, p. 139.

corner of the tower several feet above the present roof, and there are marks on the E face of the tower of an older roof the ridge of which reached a height of 60 ft. above the ground. In what would be the space under the gable of this high-pitched roof, on a line 40 ft. above the floor of the nave, and vertically over the double aperture, there is a lofty r. h. doorway 8 ft. by 2 ft. 6 in., massively constructed, and to all appearance intended for ingress and egress. The only intelligible purpose that can be ascribed to it is that of communicating with a space between a flat ceiling over the nave and the gabled external roof. The original Saxon masonry, it may be noticed, is preserved on this E wall to a much greater height than on the other three.

There is nothing of note in the nave save the triangular openings mentioned above till we come to the E part of it where as the plan shows there are to N and S projecting chapels or embryo transepts. These are still in evidence but an important feature which just preceded them has left no existing traces. When the church was undergoing restoration in 1861 Mr Butterworth, an eyewitness, tells us that there were found the remains of a cross wall spanning the nave a few feet before the transeptal projections began. There was evidently a wide arch in the centre corresponding to the existing, but now blocked, archway, terminating the present church and preceding the ruined apse. The jambs of this arch were seen projecting for a length of about 4 ft. from the N and S walls of the nave, as indicated on the plan. There is thus, it will be seen, produced a square division intervening between the nave proper and the now ruined altar house, an arrangement reminding us forcibly of what obtains at Brixworth, see its plan Fig. 50, and perhaps Repton (p. 313). The possibility of this square having been the base of a tower or a central pavilion, actually built or only contemplated, must be taken into account. In practice the W wall of division no doubt marked off the nave as the church

of the laity from the E parts of the church that were the domain of the monks whose habitations lay, and in later mediaeval fragments still lie, to the SE of the building.

The side-chambers or transepts with their various openings are given in accordance with the scheme in Mr Butterworth's book, and it will be noted that between the dividing wall between nave and square space that may be called choir or presbytery there were doorways communicating on S with the monastic precincts and on N possibly with the cemetery. What is specially remarkable about these transepts is that they were in two stories. This is proved in the case of the N one by an arched opening that exists above it in the N wall of the choir, 10 ft. from the floor ; for the S chapel the evidence is similar.

The arch which gave access to the apsidal altar house is a remarkable piece of work. The span is 12 ft. 3 in. and its height 20 ft. Round it is a plain hood mould square in section starting from the projecting heads of monsters that we have now come to know. There is a half-round shaft on the soffit of the jamb that carries a most remarkable capital of unique form very hard to understand. Its general appearance as seen from below may be judged from the sketch, Fig. 74, c. Almost on a line with the sanctuary arch but a little W of it is the E wall of the S chapel or transept, and in it is a massively constructed and enriched archway that appears to have given on to an apse flanking the main apsidal sanctuary. No corresponding apse on N is indicated so we cannot call this a triple-apsed plan. It may however be noted here that the termination of a church to E with three parallel apses of which the middle one projects beyond the two lateral apses may depend on two different schemes of plan. The three apses may be the finish of a chancel and choir aisles, or they may result from a cruciform scheme when E apses are thrown out from the walls of the transept so as to flank the apse of an aisleless presbytery. Both these schemes are fairly early and widely diffused in the West.


In Saxon architecture the form may be indicated at the cathedral of Oxford, once the church of St Frideswide's nunnery. Here in the E wall of the present N aisle of the choir are three blocked archways that were discovered some years ago by Mr Park Harrison, who also found traces of corresponding apses. It is not certain what they indicate, but they may point to an E termination for the earlier Saxon church on the spot similar to one of those familiar on the Continent; that is, either a plan with three parallel aisles or with a transept with apses in its eastern wall, an alternative favoured by Mr Micklethwaite.¹

This blocked sanctuary arch is now the end of the church, and in front of it the communion table is arranged still in Puritan fashion with seats for the communicants about it. To gain access to the ruined apse beyond, permission must be asked at the house SE of the church that embodies some remains of the later monastic buildings and is known as the Priory.² What we find here is a good section of the S wall of the straight portion of the altar house before the curved (or polygonal) part begins, a feature we already know in the Kentish apses such as St Pancras, while the apse is preserved to a distance of about 1 ft. 4 in.³ In 1922 a very interesting discovery was made in connection with the still standing straight S wall by the well known antiquary, Mr St Clair Baddeley of Painswick. At the upper part of this wall a

¹ *Archaeological Journal*, LIII, 333.

² Thanks are due to Mrs Morris of the Priory for her ready kindness in allowing the apse to be examined and photographed for the purposes of this book.

³ In the first edition of his book, published 1878, Mr Butterworth made the apse polygonal, but in the second edition of 1890, he states on p. 96 that as a result of some digging in 1889 in the cider house which now covers the site of the E portion of the apse he satisfied himself that the apse was semicircular. It may be recorded here that a personal examination in 1923 of the short portion of wall set at an angle to the straight S side did not seem to show any sign of a curve but the angle it made with the straight piece W of it seemed too obtuse






FIG. 87, Carved angel from wall of apse, Deerhurst.

(To face p. 219.)

pointed gable is formed by the edges of two flat slabs of stone that start from a horizontal string course projecting some inches and run partly through the thickness of the wall while they project about 4 in. on its external or S face.¹ The triangular space thus formed was filled with rubble and plastered in patches amongst which Mr Baddeley seemed to discern a sculptured slab. Mounting a ladder and carefully removing part of the plastering he brought to light a relief representing a winged angel seen half length. The slab on which it is carved measures 2 ft. 6 in. in height by a width of 2 ft., and Mr Baddeley was of the opinion that it had been inserted casually into this triangular recess and did not form part of the original work. The present writer is on the other hand inclined to believe it to be in situ. It is properly centred and stands on the horizontal string course above noted while its two upper corners are held in position by stone beams running into the thickness of the wall at right angles to its face. With characteristic generosity Mr Baddeley has waived his right of prior publication of his discovery and allows the appearance here, as Fig. 87, of the excellent photograph taken for the writer in 1923 under very difficult conditions by Mr Sydney Pitcher of Gloucester. Seen from near by through an upper casement in The Priory the work seems very good and the face is expressive and delicate. The sinister wing is well preserved, but on the

for the side of an octagon, and a curve on it may have been given by internal plastering. Indeed the apse may have been round inside and polygonal on the exterior, as is actually the case at Brixworth. The point is of importance in view of the polygonal apses at Brixworth and Wing and the rounded ones in Kent, but it can only be settled finally by excavation when the outstanding question of the cider house is satisfactorily adjusted. There is a good piece of work to be done here, and the sooner it is taken in hand the better.

¹ It is to be remarked that this triangular gable in relief at the top of this S face is very like what occurs at Wing, Bucks, Fig. 147, where each face of the polygonal apse shows a similar feature, and this would make a polygonal apse more probable at Deerhurst, at any rate in its external aspect.

dexter side and the lower part of the bust the stone seems to have been hacked away apparently as a key for plaster. The groove cutting across the lower corner is a mark of the gable of some later erection.

The foregoing notice of the Saxon work at Deerhurst has run to some considerable length, but it could have been largely extended by the discussion of points of interest that have been perforce passed over in silence. From what has been said however, surely an unprejudiced reader will derive the impression of something worthy of his attention and of his thought. That lofty W tower for example, so rigidly plain, with its evidences of occupation by more than one section of the community ; its mysterious external doors now suspended in the air but once communicating with adjacent structures the forms and uses of which we can only guess at ; its tablet still bare of its destined inscription ; its three comparatively low archways of passage on the ground level, which seem to vindicate its independence as a structure for itself, and not a mere frontispiece or portal to the church. Then the side chapels or transepts with their various openings and their presumed upper stories—how were they used and how did their different parts serve the multiform purposes of the small monastic community ? Was there any central feature over the square of the choir, and was the nave originally flanked by aisles ? Were all the sides or all the circuit of the apse treated with gables and was there a display in all of them of decorative sculpture, or is the existing carved panel only an accident, perhaps not even contemporary with the fabric ? The building is fascinating as it is, and it is to be hoped that before long the ruined apse will be so treated as to hold its proper place as an integral part of the fabric.

Intriguing as Deerhurst may be, the building that is here associated with it, Britford by Salisbury, presents though on a much smaller scale a collection of forms just as varied

and inconsequential. As one approaches the church one seems to see a well set-up mediaeval fane with everything proper about it—aisleless nave, transepts, central tower, and chancel—all in ornate Gothic style. On entering the nave however we pass under a Saxon arch over the S door, and find ourselves in a substantially Saxon nave to which a later E portion has been added. This nave, Fig. 88, measures 44 ft. 4 in. in length by a width of 20 ft. 2 in., and at the




FIG. 88, Plan of Saxon portion of Britford Church by Salisbury.
(The parts to the east of the openings are later.)

extreme E end of it there were found some years ago two very remarkable arched openings in the N and S walls. They had been built up and plastered over, and being now carefully cleared and protected by small outbuildings on the exterior, they appear in very good preservation. The N archway is 5 ft. 9 in. wide by a height of 7 ft. 10 in., that on S 5 ft. 7 in. wide and 7 ft. 8½ in. high. The present S doorway into the nave further W than these openings is in a third Saxon archway 8 ft. 9 in. high by 5 ft. 9 in. wide, but it is probable that this third opening has no special connection with the two others. These last correspond pretty closely

in position and in size, but are curiously different in technical treatment. The arch of the S opening (Fig. 89)¹ is turned in large Roman bricks evidently re-used. Some of them are voussoir shape, about 13 in. long by a thickness of 3 in. at one end tapering to 2 in. They were not however, as was noted before (p. 66), all set voussoir fashion so as to fit the form of the arch, but as often as not they are reversed so that the thin edge instead of the thick is on the extrados of the arch. The necessary wedge-like forms without which the arch could not be constructed are given by the mortar joints which are thicker on the extrados than below.

The jambs are lined by tall and narrow upright stones, about 4 ft. 6 in. high by 9 in. wide, standing on plinths and set at the outer thirds of the jamb with a recess in the interval between them, the whole thickness of the wall being 2 ft. 5 in. They are crowned by imposts which show the remarkable peculiarity already observed in Roman work and at Escomb (pp. 50, 140) that they are cut away to receive the head of the jamb stones which are mortised into them (Fig. 89). This feature is of course of pronounced early character. On the exterior face of the wall, now made conveniently accessible from the inside, there was a square sectioned strip of stone $2\frac{1}{2}$ in. in face by a projection of $1\frac{3}{4}$ in. that ascended the jamb and then followed the curve of the arch after the manner of a hood mould. The imposts were probably returned along the outer face of the wall to meet this strip. The same feature occurs on the exterior face of the N opening, and there are pretty clear indications on the inner side of the S opening that a similar strip had appeared on this face also. At the sinister side of the drawing in Fig. 89 is shown the vertical pilaster strip that, like the impost, has been hacked away flush with the wall and then covered with plaster, now removed. The traces of this strip-work are of great chronological significance.

¹ Fig. 89 has for the sake of clearness been repeated from (p. 66).

The soffit of the N opening (Fig. 90) is treated quite differently. It is panelled, so to say, with flat square slabs that are cut on their faces to the curve of the arch, and that leave between them recesses, like cassettes. The work is very careful, for the curved soffit slabs are framed as it were by bricks set edgeways, and bricks form the floor of the recesses or cassettes.

The jambs have the plinth, imposts, and upright stones




FIG. 89, Face of jamb with springing of S arch, Britford, Wilts.




FIG. 90, Soffit of N arch, Britford, Wilts.

like the other archway, but these are not let into the imposts. In the space between the uprights there are square slabs with recesses above and below them. The most remarkable feature of the whole work is the ornamentation on the upright jamb stones and intermediate squares on the E jamb of this N opening, that has been shown in Fig. 82.

There are other details which might be noticed and which constitute differences between the two openings, but enough has now been said about their technical treatment. The

purpose for which they were intended is a matter for conjecture.

There are practically three alternatives. They may have been (1) doorways to the exterior, (2) arcade openings, the survivors of a series giving access to side aisles, (3) archways admitting to side chapels. (1) is excluded, not because there is no rebate for doors, for Saxon doorways in most cases (p. 30) appear not to have had rebates, but because the ornamentation on the jambs is quite out of character with mere doorways. (2) The S opening would work into the scheme of an arcade with the more westerly opening on the same side where is now the doorway of entrance, but the piers between the openings of such an arcade would have to be about 6 ft. wide. The arches however are too small in scale, especially too low, in proportion to the width of the nave for us to suppose them arcade openings. (3) There remains the supposition that they gave access at one time to side chapels, in which connection their ornate appearance would be quite in character, and their dimensions would be proportioned rather to the presumably small size of the chapels than to that of the nave out of which they led. Assuming this to have been their destination the eastward position of the side chapels is significant, for an arrangement similar to that indicated on the plan of Deerhurst is obviously suggested. It is not the time yet however to discuss the development or at any rate the various modifications of the Saxon ground plan for this is a theme included in the treatment of Period III, to which indeed by one of its details Britford belongs.

Deerhurst, it has been noted, exhibits none of the special features of the above period that were briefly enumerated in Chapter II, a fact of capital importance in relation to its chronology for it would admit it into the early and middle periods of X while excluding it from its later decades. Its ambitious character and multiplied spaces and openings, with the comparative abundance of its carved enrichment,

would suit a period of revival and of energy such as southern England knew under the kings of the line of Alfred, while the appearance in it of the W tower must preclude any attempt to throw it back into the great times of Period I or A. We take it here as the first, and in accordance with natural likelihood one of the finest and most living of the modes of architectural expression which the revival of X called into being. Illogical and even amateurish we may call it if we will, but only the narrowest and most prosaic architectural critic could refuse his sympathy and interest to work that has undeniable character and boldness. Britford, though without any element of grandeur, exhibits in the treatment of the N and S openings an almost pathetic anxiety to secure the most varied decorative effect by a fanciful handling of materials. The work is the reverse of commonplace, and suits the epoch to which it is here assigned.

Britford forms a transition to Period III or C because these apertures are framed with what has been termed (p. 29) 'strip-work round openings,' that is to say, a square sectioned narrow pilaster of plain stonework runs up the N and S faces of the jambs a few inches from their soffit-edge and is then carried on without a break round the curve of the arch. This becomes in Period C one of the commonest and most enduring features of Saxon buildings, and we seem to be able to see it actually in formation in the two structures which have now been subjected to analysis. The vertical strip is of foreign importation and we shall find its origin in the familiar Lisenen of the Rhineland, but the bending of it round the arch in our Saxon fashion is not found abroad and is of native origin. Now a very prominent and almost constant feature at Deerhurst is the square-sectioned so-called 'hood mould' over openings, that, taken by itself, might seem to some too advanced a detail to accord with the date assigned to the structure. This becomes quite a normal feature in later Romanesque and Gothic architecture, but here it was used

early and seems out of character with the severely plain unmoulded arches of the openings themselves. This square-sectioned hood mould joined with the vertical strip derived from the Lisene makes up the characteristic Saxon 'strip-work round openings,' which is not as a whole derived from any external sources, and may have in the way indicated a purely native origin.

CHAPTER IX

INFLUENCES FROM THE RHINELAND AND SAXONY

IN THE latter part of the eighth century we begin to discern in our native work the signs of an artistic change responsible for many features of the later Anglo-Saxon architectural style. The change begins in the domain of coinage. The 'sceat' coinage of VI and VII and the earlier part of VIII, as was shown in Vol. III, Ch. II, was based on the 'trientes' coins of Merovingian Gaul, but Offa of Mercia superseded these picturesquely designed pieces by a coinage of a new denomination, the silver penny, of a type that lasted down to and survived the Norman Conquest and continued in use till late Plantagenet times. Now this penny issue was an imitation of the *denarius* of Charles the Great, and this fact holds for the present subject a profound significance. It is a sign that England is no longer in touch with Merovingian Gaul but with the Carolingian dominion the chief seat of which was on the Rhine. The Franks were always divided into two sections. At first there were the 'Salian' Franks who dwelt by the salt sea in what is Frisia and the Netherlands, and the 'Ripuarian' Franks who held the districts on the banks of the Rhine further to the east. Later on the same distinction is expressed by the terms 'Neustrian' and 'Austrasian.' Clovis who conquered Gaul was a Salian Frank and his successors the Merovingian kings ruled over what became Neustria, while the Austrasian Franks also governed by descendants of Clovis kept the position of the older Ripuarians on the Rhine. After the decline of the Merovingian monarchy in VII the strength of the Franks

lay to the east and it was there that the Carolingian house grew to power. Charles the Great came of course to rule over all sections of the Frankish nation but he remained an Austrasian with his chief seat at Aachen near the Rhine. As a consequence of the divisions of his empire after his death, out of the older Neustria and Austrasia there were ultimately constituted the mediaeval and modern France and Germany.

If Kentish Æthelbert wedded the daughter of the Neustrian king in Gaul, two centuries later we find Offa of Mercia not only adopting the Austrasian coinage but negotiating with Charles the Great for the hand of one of Charles' rather impracticable daughters for the Mercian crown prince. The fact shows at once Offa's distinguished position and the connection now established between England and Carolingian Germany.

In the time of Charles the Great there were two chief centres of culture one in each division of the empire, Tours upon the Loire and Charles' own favoured seat at Aachen. The English came into contact with both west and east, for Alcuin was settled at Tours and planted in its school his own Northumbrian learning, while at an earlier period Willebrord and Boniface had wrought for the conversion of Frisia and Central Germany. These missionaries were accompanied and followed by a large number of Anglo-Saxon fellow-workers¹ so that a special connection was at once set up between our own country and the regions beyond the Rhine. It is a significant fact that whereas at the close of VII Benedict Biscop, when he needed the aid of workers in glass, sent for them to Gaul,² in the next century Cuthbert, abbot of Jarrow, in a similar case transmitted his request for the aid of experts in glass working to Mainz, to his countryman Lul, who had succeeded Boniface in the headship of the Church in Germany.

¹ Vol. I, p. 216.

² Plummer's Bede, I, 368.

The intercourse was not only religious but political. The Carolingian court became the recognized refuge for English political exiles¹ and at the close of VIII the famous Ecgberht of Wessex had stayed with Charles the Great in this capacity for more than a decade. Ecgberht's son and successor, Æthelwulf the father of Alfred, took for his second wife a daughter of Charles the Bald, while in a later generation grand-daughters of Alfred and sisters of king Æthelstan wedded the Carling Charles the Simple, and the Emperor in Germany Otto the Great of Saxony, and established a tradition of alliance which was maintained up to the Conquest.

Of the time of Harold Bishop Stubbs remarked 'The intercourse of England with Germany was close at this time. The Emperor had married a daughter of Cnut, half-sister of the King: the Athelings, Edmund and Edward, had married nieces of the Emperor . . . German Clerks were at the head of the Wessex Church,'² and to this we may add the words of William of Poitiers,³ when he notices the flourishing condition of the arts in England at the time of the Conquest, to the effect that Germans skilled in the arts were accustomed to go and settle among the English, and to contribute to the extensive output to which Saxon men and women artistically gifted were also devoting their energies. To William this English art was something remarkable, and superior to what he knew in the Norman Duchy, which shows that up to the Conquest Saxon and Norman art were quite distinct.

The glory of the Carolingian age was dimmed under the weak successors of Charles who opposed so feeble a resistance to the Vikings, but a new and flourishing period of European culture and art was inaugurated by the rule of the Ottos of Saxony. It was from Saxony that King Alfred, about 889, invited the Old Saxon John, a monk of Corvey, to be the first

¹ J. R. Green, *Short History of the English People*, ch. 1, § 14.

² *The Foundation of Waltham Abbey*, Oxford, 1861, p. ix.

³ Gul. Pict., apud Duchesne, *Hist. Norm. Script. Ant.*, p. 211, B.

abbot, and perhaps the builder, of the abbey he founded at Athelney in Somerset (p. 196).¹

In one sense the Old or continental Saxony of X was like the New Saxony, in its insular home, of VII. In our own Kent and Northumbria at the earlier epoch, a Christian culture largely fashioned on Roman models had been established in regions that had been almost wholly de-Romanized ; in the continental Saxony of the post-Carolingian period, a region that had never formed part of the Empire, and had received its Christianity as an importation at a comparatively recent date, became the centre of an activity in learning and art that the Germans claim as the first truly native expression of their national genius. The religious life, and the learning which depended on the religious life, of the regions in question were as we have seen largely owed to the emissaries from Anglo-Saxon England, but so soon as the line of Henry the Fowler was established in its imperial state, this quarter of Europe, saved by its inland position from the ravages of the Vikings, developed a culture which rose above the level that was anywhere else attained. Among existing buildings of importance that exhibit the Romanesque style in its developed form, one of the first in point of date is the convent church of Gernrode in Saxony. The Minster of Charles the Great at Aachen, which some regard as beginning the series of Romanesque monuments, is not Romanesque but rather Early Christian in style. Gernrode, which dates substantially from the last half of X, is genuine Romanesque, and there are not many monuments of its class the date of which is so early and so assured.

The whole architecture of this great region NE of the Rhine, won for Christianity under the Carlings, assumes a special character that we shall do well to note. The region embraces what we know as Thuringia, Saxony, Westphalia, Rhenish Prussia, and the provinces of the lower Rhine ; and

¹ W. of Malmes., *Gesta Pontificum*, Rolls Series, no. 52, p. 199.

the architecture of it differs from that of other parts of the vast Carolingian empire. The old political distinction between Neustria and Austrasia is here reproduced, and the Romanesque of the W or Neustrian part of the Empire develops on lines distinct from that of the Austrasian regions extending eastwards beyond the Rhine. The first is represented centrally by the architecture of Normandy,¹ and Norman forms differ in many marked characteristics from those of Westphalia or of Saxony.

This fact lies at the foundation of any systematic treatment of the later Anglo-Saxon buildings. In several of their most characteristic features these only reproduce what is common in the Trans-Rhenane provinces, and though Anglo-Saxon buildings have other very distinct features of their own which give the style independence, yet they have so much in common with German ones that we shall probably be right to reckon our own country, in the century before the Norman Conquest, an autonomous province of Austrasian architecture. Later Anglo-Saxon architecture, it should be clearly understood, has no special affinity with Norman, but on the contrary, till the fusion of the two realms at the Conquest, it represented a distinct architectural tradition. At the time of the fusion and for perhaps a half-century after it there do appear buildings uniting Saxon and Norman characteristics or at any rate exhibiting the features of the two styles not worked into one but existing side by side, as if Saxon and Norman masons had shared the work each keeping his own traditional forms and methods. The buildings in which this phenomenon makes its appearance are of interest from the political and social as well as the artistic standpoint, and a special section of this volume will be devoted to them as illustrating what may be termed the 'Saxo-Norman overlap.' Until however the Norman element is definitely in evidence the two styles

¹ Normandy came to be recognized as Neustria par excellence, and a great work of XVII on the abbeyes and churches of Normandy is entitled *Neustria Pia*.

have very little in common, and for this reason until this overlap begins it is as a rule comparatively easy to distinguish a Saxon from a Norman structure.

The task now before us is first to indicate those characteristics in which Austrasian Romanesque differs from Neustrian, and next to give the reasons for including later Anglo-Saxon architecture in the former province, only those points which are of real significance for the purpose in hand being taken into account. The principle here laid down may be tested with reference to (1) distribution of the parts of a building, (2) treatment of wall surfaces, (3) openings, (4) details.

With regard to (1), the general arrangement of Romanesque churches, aisled or aisleless, cruciform or lacking transepts, terminating apsidally or with square ends, varies everywhere, but it varies rather from example to example than from province to province,¹ that is to say the chief types of plan will be found represented here and there in all the Romanesque districts, no exclusive preference being shown anywhere for any one particular type of plan, and variety of choice being everywhere exercised. It is however possible to distinguish the districts of Romanesque according to certain predilections operative in one region rather than in another. For example, the disjunction of the tower from the body of the church creates a marked difference between Italian Romanesque and Romanesque N of the Alps, yet in our own country East Anglia is quite familiar with the isolated tower, and we find it also in France and even in Normandy² where as a rule the logical connection of part with part is maintained throughout a building. Of such provincial fashions one that concerns us here is the German twi-apsidal plan which that

¹ De Lasteyrie, *Architecture Religieuse*, ch. xiii, has some pertinent remarks on the variety in Romanesque churches, and the futility of most 'Essais de Classification.'

² e.g. at Ver.

country had almost entirely to herself. Among the first instances there known are those of Fulda, of the end of VIII, and of the church on the Plan of St Gall of the beginning of IX, but later on in German Romanesque generally the two apses became fairly common. This same feature occurs in Saxon England, but we cannot regard it as an importation from Germany since we are told of its occurrence at Abingdon in VII (p. 117) and Rivoira even suggests that this influenced Fulda.¹ On the other hand the two apses, E and W, at Ch. Canterbury are due to an extension of the building in X and German influence is here admissible. There was conceivably, as was suggested by Mr Micklethwaite,² another later English example at Lydd on Romney Marsh in Kent, and it is worth noting as a possible survival of a Saxon form in Norman times that the XII church at Langford, near Maldon in Essex, had an apse at each end, the W one, of Norman technique, still surviving. Again, it is worth noting as a provincial difference between Saxon England and Normandy that the aisleless church is in the former normal whereas de Lasteyrie notes that in the Duchy 'la règle était de construire des collatéraux même dans les églises de campagne . . . peu importantes.'³

The above is perhaps negligible, but we come to a very marked instance of the difference between the two Frankish provinces and of the adoption by the Saxons of the Austrasian fashion when we deal with the use and placing of towers.

In the regions with which we are chiefly concerned the tower is not only as in Italy a picturesque and aesthetically pleasing adjunct to the building but an integral part of its structure and in many cases a dominant feature of its plan. The historical treatment of the tower starts with a difficulty, for we are ignorant when and where and for what purpose these important additions to the Christian church came into

¹ *Lombardic Architecture*, II, 298.

² *Arch. Journ.*, LV, 344.

³ *Architecture Religieuse*, p. 492.

vogue. De Lasteyrie thinks they were introduced early and served from the first as belfries but did not become numerous till VIII or IX.¹ In one form, that of the centrally disposed pavilion, comparatively wide and low, the tower may have come into use in Merovingian Gaul, but the texts do not furnish full assurance.² It has been argued also that towers must have come in quite independently of bells, which were at first too small to need such massive installation, and their origin has been sought in the turrets that contain the winding stairs giving access to galleries in churches of the




FIG. 91, Front and side view of W end of Minster at Aachen, after C. Rhoen.

'central' type, such as S. Vitale at Ravenna where stair turrets of the kind actually exist. S. Vitale, of VI, furnished the general model for Charles the Great's Minster at Aachen, and this famous church comes into prominence in connection with the early use of towers in the central regions of Europe. We are only concerned here with one feature of the structure the imposing W forebuilding which contains on the ground floor the entrance portal but also provides access to the gallery which runs round the central space of the interior. It has been altered in the upper part and is given in Figs. 91 and 92 according to the restoration pub-

¹ *Architecture Religieuse*, ch. xii, p. 382.

² *ibid.*, p. 88.

lished some years ago by C. Rhoen of Aachen. Two stair turrets irregularly semicircular in plan communicate with the gallery and above it with chambers on the third story of the forebuilding, where hung the bells.

This forebuilding contains in itself the germ of some of the features the varied treatment of which supplies interest to the history of the Romanesque façade. If the flanking stair turrets be brought into greater prominence and the central portion between them correspondingly reduced, the result is the twin-towered façade with vestibule and W gallery between the lateral masses, that is so




FIG. 92, Section of W end of Minster at Aachen.

common in advanced Romanesque in all lands N of the Alps. This form of façade composition belongs to N Romanesque in general, but there are other forms of composition suggested equally by Aachen that are specially mid-European. If the central forebuilding be emphasized it will grow into imposing though at times somewhat clumsy masses like those which are reared at the W ends of churches such as Onze Lieve Vrouwekerk at Maastricht ; St Patroclus, Soest ; or Paderborn. The half-round stair turrets, less important in proportion to the centre than at Aachen, are in most buildings of this class still retained, but they may on the other hand shrink and disappear so that the central portion stands out alone as a single W tower.

It is a well known fact that single W towers with or without the lateral adjuncts are characteristic of the architecture of Westphalia and of the provinces of the lower Rhine, but are comparatively rare in other districts of Romanesque architecture. In Germany at all periods of Romanesque we find the single W tower claiming its place as a feature

of monumental structures side by side with the twin-towered scheme, and in the Rhineland capital the noble Apostles church and St Mauritius¹ reared their single W towers in the same city that showed the flanked façades of St Pantaleon and of the ancient cathedral. In some German examples, as at Maursmünster, near Strasbourg, the flanking towers are retained but a central W tower makes its appearance between and overtopping them, while in certain regions, as in Westphalia and a large part of Rhenish Prussia,² the latter feature suppresses and ultimately supersedes the double arrangement, till it comes entirely to dominate the composition of this end of the building.

Save in England alone we do not find this treatment of W ends much in vogue in any of the other districts of Romanesque architecture. Single W towers occur often enough in France, and Dehio and von Bezold, who remark on their imposing character, consider that they had originally a defensive intent.³ Examples are to be found at St-Germain-des-Prés at Paris, at Poissy near the capital, and in the regions to W (St Savin near Poitiers) and S (Notre-Dame-des-Doms, Avignon).⁴ They are uncommon however in the N districts with which we are most concerned. In Normandy for example the single W tower is in the Romanesque period a great rarity,⁵ though one occurs at Notre-Dame-d'Esquay and another at Colleville-sur-Mer, both in Calvados. There now exist W towers attached to numerous churches in the Duchy, but these are nearly all of much later date when the influence of English fashions was operative.⁶ As a general

¹ Now destroyed and replaced by a new building.

² A survey of the monuments of this region is given in the work edited by Paul Clemen, *die Kunstdenkmäler der Rheinprovinz*, Düsseldorf, 1891, etc.

³ *Kirchliche Baukunst*, 1, 586.

⁴ De Lasteyrie, p. 393.

⁵ 'En Normandie,' writes Ruprich Robert about the 'clochers,' 'nous n'en voyons qu'exceptionnellement sur les portes d'entrée des neufs.' *L'Arch. Norm.*, p. 97.

⁶ See de Caumont, *Statistique Monumentale du Calvados*, Paris, 1846, etc.

rule in the case of large churches, S of the Alps the towerless Early Christian façade,¹ N of it the twin-towered façade, is the prevailing form, but in Germany and England the single W tower claims equal consideration. This fact is clear, but the significance and historical explanation of the fact are problematical. An architectural connection between England and Germany is certainly suggested, and this would agree with our general reading of the historical relations which bound together the two regions. The general considerations already adduced would lead to the hypothesis that the scheme travelled from mid-Europe to England, but it must be noted that there are peculiarities about some of our English W towers that appear so far as we can see to be original. In point of actual date, again, some of our pre-Conquest W towers are earlier than the existing single W towers of Westphalia and other parts of Germany. It has been suggested above that the germ of the single-towered façade may be discerned in the W forebuilding at Aachen. As a fact, though Aachen in its main feature, the central plan, was immediately influential in churches such as Germigny-des-Prés by the Loire, we do not find monumental evidence of any immediate influence exercised by its W front. This does not however invalidate the hypothesis under consideration. The influence of Aachen was continuous, and the W choir of Essen in Rhenish Prussia at the end of X, and Ottmarsheim in Elsass at the middle of XI, are both modelled on the famous octagon. In the latter part of XI in our own country the influence is still living, for we learn that Robert of Lorraine bishop of Hereford 'built a church there on a round scheme, copying in his own fashion the basilica of Aachen.'² In like manner the W forebuilding at Aachen may have served as prototype for the cathedrals of Pader-

¹ The twin-towered façades in the peninsula occur mostly in S of it and in Sicily, where they are accounted for by Norman influence.

² W. of Malmes., *Gest. Pont.*, p. 300.

born and Minden of the early part of XI as well as for the Apostles church at Cologne and the very numerous later examples in the regions already indicated.

(2) Passing then to the subject of the treatment of wall surfaces, we have the striking difference between the provinces which it is our object to contrast, that the buttress, a marked feature of Norman Romanesque, hardly occurs in the Romanesque of Germany, where its place is taken by the so-called 'Lisene,' a feature with some superficial resemblance to a buttress, but differing therefrom in that it is a decorative rather than a constructive adjunct. Aachen it is true possesses buttresses, for these occur in pairs at the angles of the central octagon the corners of which they are designed to strengthen against the thrust of the domical vault. It is however noticed by Dehio that after this the buttress almost disappears from German Romanesque though it is found abundantly in the W province.¹

The German Lisene differs from the buttress in the following characteristics. The buttress may as in Early Norman buildings be of slight projection, but in that case it has substantial width and represents a real addition to the strength of the masonry. The Lisene is also of slight projection but is at the same time narrow so that it hardly increases the lateral stability of the wall. While buttresses, especially in Norman work, appear first of all as strengthening the corners of buildings, and when they are distributed along the wall have generally some relation to structure and inner arrangement, the Lisenen are disposed along the wall-surface in closer juxtaposition than would be the case with buttresses, and are out of relation to the internal construction.

It has been noticed about these German Lisenen, as about our Anglo-Saxon pilaster strips, that they look like the uprights of half-timber work. At Gernrode for example such Lisenen occur, and as Gernrode, which lies at the N base of

¹ *Kirchliche Baukunst*, I, 154.

the Hartz Mountains, is in a wood-building country and one where no Roman traditions existed, its Lisenen might reasonably be claimed as independent creations or as derivations from timber construction. The history of the feature in German buildings can however be traced back till it is found originating not in any form of woodwork but in the classical pilaster that is so familiar a feature in later Roman architecture. There are many examples in which debased classical bases and caps attached to the long slender strips place the ultimate derivation of these beyond reasonable doubt. St Castor of Coblenz for example exhibits such bases and caps to the strips which run up the middle of its twin W towers of IX, and the W front at Trier with the E end of Mainz, both of XI, present the same features. If we go further back, the predecessors of these strips exhibit still more clearly the classical form, and the 'Baptistry of St Jean' at Poitiers, probably about VII, and the almost certainly Early Carolingian 'Thorhalle' at Lorsch give them unmistakably as copies of Roman pilasters. Italy was of course their original home, but the Rhinelanders made them their own and it was from this source that they passed to Anglo-Saxon England.

Saxon walls in general, like the German walls, are unbuttressed, though the buttress occurs in three Kentish examples, St Martin and St Pancras, Canterbury, and Reculver; also in the curious church of St. Peter-on-the-Wall, Essex, Fig. 48, and round the apse at Brixworth. The place of the buttress in Saxon work is filled by the pilaster strip. The pilaster strip accords with the German Lisene in that it is not meant like the buttress to add strength to the wall. It is too narrow and too slight in projection for any purpose of the kind, but is simply a flat upright band of stonework varying in width from 4 in. to 1 ft. and running at intervals up the wall for the sake of decorative effect. A buttress moreover is applied to the wall from the ground upwards and springs from the same root as the wall itself,

while the pilaster strip on the contrary often starts from a stone projecting corbel-fashion from the wall at some height above the ground, as may be seen on various parts of the exterior of Earls Barton tower shown on the Frontispiece. There are examples too in which it rises from the top of the arch of a doorway, which no buttress would think of doing. Barholme, Lincolnshire, and Stanton Lacy, Shropshire, are instances of this, and Boarhunt, Hants, Fig. 138, shows it resting on a horizontal string course at a considerable elevation without any connection underneath with the ground.

The difference between the decorative pilaster strip and




FIG. 93, Comparison of Saxon pilaster strips at Earls Barton tower (A) with Early Norman corner buttresses at West Malling Church, Kent (B).

the strengthening buttress is seen by comparing in Fig. 93 the plan of the face of a Saxon tower A with that of the face of an Early Norman tower B. The flat, broad, clasping corner buttresses of the latter are as characteristically Norman as the narrow strips only about 4 in. in width of the former are characteristically Saxon. The sort of appearance presented by such strips can be seen in Fig. 7. The pilaster strips are irregularly spaced and are 7 in. wide. Such strips are at times, but not always, constructed in the l. and s. technique as shown in Fig. 94. The appearance of these features which should never be more than 10 in. or 1 ft. in width is the most certain test we possess that the piece of walling where they appear is of Saxon origin, for there is only one

doubtful instance known to the writer in which Norman builders seem to have availed themselves of this feature. Though in the chapter entitled 'The Saxo-Norman overlap' (p. 377 f.) we shall find examples of l. and s. quoining, double splayed windows, mid-wall work, strip-work round openings, and other Saxon peculiarities employed in buildings more than half Norman, the pilaster strip seems only to occur in this connection in the enigmatic masonry in the W portion of the S wall of the chancel of Milborne Port, Somerset (p. 428).

How similar in their decorative employment are the pilaster strips and the Lisenen may be seen in Fig. 95 where Lisenen, arcading, and string course on the NW turret at Gernrode of the last part of X are compared with similar features on our own tower, ascribed here to about the same date, at Earls Barton. That the pilasters are in both cases connected with decorative arcading is significant as showing derivation from Italy. In the peninsula shallow pilasters are seen joined by small round arches as a decorative enrichment of external walls as early as the Mausoleum of Galla Placidia at Ravenna of the middle of V, and become very common in Italian Romanesque. Arcading with straight




FIG. 94. Pilaster strip, Breamore, Hants. The strips are about 11 in. wide.

sided arches occurs on the 'Thorhalle' at Lorsch, Fig. 96, and in our own country in a simpler form we find the same




FIG. 95, Details at Gernrode (A) and Earls Barton (B) compared.

motive on the originally external N wall of the nave of Geddington Church, Northants, now seen from the later N aisle




FIG. 96, So-called 'Thorhalle' at Lorsch, near Worms.

above the inserted nave arcades. Rivoira makes the decorative arcading with straight sided arches a specially Saxon

feature.¹ Round-arched arcading joining pilaster strips occurs round the polygonal apse at Wing, Bucks, as shown in Fig. 147. Furthermore the arcade motive appears as a survival in the curious treatment of the tops of Saxon pilaster strips at Repton, Fig. 144 B. In the case of the noble tower of Langford, Oxon, the pilaster strips, 12½ in. wide, end at the top under a string course in step-like fashion—a distinctly Saxon motive, Fig. 121.

These pilaster strips, it may be remarked, are very common in the Saxon churches of Hampshire and of Sussex and Surrey as far E as the longitude of Brighton, but are not found in Kent. They are abundant in the midland districts but much less common in the North. N of Barton-on-Humber the only example signalized is that at Kirkdale, Yorkshire (p. 308).

The purpose alike of the Lisenen and of the Saxon pilaster strips derived from them is therefore an aesthetic purpose, the breaking up and diversifying of a plain wall surface. This same end may be compassed in quite another fashion by a decorative treatment of the actual walling in the form of mosaic in which geometrical patterns are formed by horizontal lines, zigzags, hexagons, herring-bone work, stars, etc. This treatment is specially in evidence in a class of buildings in France that used to be ascribed to Merovingian times, but are now dated by authorities such as R. de Lasteyrie and Camille Enlart as Carolingian. For our present purpose this makes little difference as a post-Carolingian monument is equally instructive with one of VII as an example of Neustrian technique. The work in question is so obviously an extension of the Roman fashion of constructing a comparatively thick wall of core and facing, and of diversifying this facing with 'opus reticulatum,' herring-boning, lines of bricks, and the like, that whatever the date of the actual monuments it seems likely that the technique goes back to earlier Frankish days, and the elaboration of it would corre-

¹ *Lombardic Architecture*, II, 170, 189.

spond to the sumptuousness in personal attire and accoutrements that characterized Merovingian princes and nobles.

The monuments in question, such as Savenières (Maine-et-Loire) St-Généroux (Deux-Sèvres) Cravant (near Loches in Touraine) Vieux-Pont-en-Auge (near Mézidon in Normandy), are Neustrian, and the work hardly ever occurs in the Austrasian province. It is seen no doubt in the so-called 'Clara Thurm' at Cologne, but this is antique—a part of the Roman enceinte of the city. The just-mentioned 'Thorhalle,' or entrance portal, at Lorsch near Worms also shows it, Fig. 96, but Lorsch appears to have been built under Western influences, and in this both R. Adamy¹ and de Lasteyrie,² though differing widely as to its date, are in accord. The technique was handed on to the Normans, who employ it in simple forms such as the familiar square stones set lozenge fashion that can be seen in the SW corner of the Infirmary Cloister at Westminster, and is also shown Fig. 175 as well as in the well known and abundant herring-bone work.

It is noticed by M. Enlart in his *Archaeological Manual*, *Architecture Religieuse*,³ that 'La Normandie prit goût plus qu'une autre province à ces combinaisons,' but all this decorative treatment of facing stones is alien to Anglo-Saxon practice. For one thing the Saxon wall is as a rule thin and not constructed with core and facing, and the only decorative treatment applied to it, beyond a coating of plaster, is the pilaster strip. Herring-bone work which may be seen in or over Saxon walls is in reality almost always of Norman authorship, and the idea that it is Saxon in character should finally be given up. Seeing however that the technique was used by the Romans the possibility of its occasional employment by the Saxon mason cannot be excluded.⁴ Some walling on the inner face of the apse at Deerhurst seems most

¹ *Die fränkische Thorhalle und Klosterkirche zu Lorsch*, Darmstadt, 1891.

² *Architecture Religieuse*, 167 f.

³ 2nd Ed., Paris, 1919, 2 vols. Vol. 1, p. 13.

⁴ See (p. 471).

like a Saxon use of it, but where it is in a Saxon wall we should be inclined as a rule to suspect reparation by a Norman or Norman-trained mason. We find it at times on the upper stages of towers that are Norman additions, while the Saxon masonry below shows no signs of it. Examples are at Brixworth ; Lavendon, Bucks ; Little Bardfield, Essex, and other places. The classic example of herring-boning in a Saxon church is that at Diddlebury or Delbury in Shropshire, and this is really crucial in deciding that such work is Norman and




FIG. 96 bis, A, Double splayed Saxon window at Diddlebury Church, Shropshire. From a drawing by the late J. T. Irvine.




FIG. 96 bis, B, Herring-bone facing from the interior of Diddlebury Church, Shropshire.

not Saxon, for a Saxon wall here has been coated by the Normans internally with a decorative veneer of herring-bone masonry. Diddlebury is an interesting and well known church that possibly possessed a W axial tower of a kind that will be subsequently noticed (p. 342). The N wall of the nave is on the exterior clearly Saxon, as is evidenced by the characteristic N doorway and double splayed window shown in Fig. 8 and in Fig. 96 bis, A ; the S wall pierced by a later arcade has no distinguishing marks except its thinness, about 2 ft. 3 or 4 in., and is also almost certainly Saxon in

fabric. On the interior for a strip of about 3 ft. deep along the upper part of the N wall we see the inner face of the Saxon wall of about this same thickness, but this N wall on all the rest of its surface is thickened to about 2 ft. 11 in. by a facing of carefully wrought herring-bone work that is returned for a few feet along the W wall of the nave. The stones are 14 or 15 in. long and vary in width from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 in. with mortar joints $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ in. thick. There are no horizontal layers between the courses as in Fig. 1. The facing is clearly an addition to the original fabric and is certainly Norman.

(3) In the matter of openings we are chiefly concerned with windows and have to consider (a) the double or multiplex aperture commonly used in the belfry stages of towers to afford a passage for sound, and (b) the small window pierced for the admission of light. In both of these the forms used in the Austrasian province are different from those found in France, and in both cases Anglo-Saxon work resembles German, while the Normans are true to their own local traditions of Neustria.

It is not the mere subdivision of the single opening that concerns us, for this is certainly not confined to the E province, and occurs commonly in belfries in Normandy and other Romanesque districts. The point of importance is the special contrivance by which the arrangement is engineered and which can be judged of from the accompanying drawing, Fig. 97. This method differs from that adopted, e.g. in Normandy, but agrees in the main with that which we shall find represented in the double openings of our Anglo-Saxon buildings. The characteristic difference resides in the fact that in the Rhineland example, Fig. 97, as well as in Anglo-Saxon work, the whole thickness of the wall is dealt with at once, whereas the Normans recess the opening so as to decrease in step-fashion the thickness of the wall until only the middle portion remains to be supported by the central shaft.

It may be worth while to pause here for a moment to note the various devices by which in different provinces of Christian architecture the wall between two arched openings is sustained by bringing the weight down upon a central




FIG. 97, Double opening with mid-wall shaft in the W front of the Cathedral at Trier, of XI.

shaft or shafts. The earliest method in point of date is (1) to double the shafts, placing one behind the other so that their two capitals support the whole extent of the load. This occurs in Early Christian work in Italy, as at the Baptistry at Nocera previously noticed,¹ and is also in common use in cloisters. We shall find an instance of its employment in Saxon architecture. Italian also is (2) the method of corbeling out the capital of a single central shaft till its abacus corresponds in length to the thickness of the wall. This

¹ Vol. I, p. 348.

occurs commonly in the belfry openings of Italian campanili. The same method is in vogue in German Romanesque, and it is found with us in one or two examples, Sompting, Sussex ; Bolam, Northumberland ; Jarrow, Durham, that date about the time of the Conquest in England. The procedure most generally adopted in our pre-Conquest architecture is a modification of this. Instead of the capital of the central or 'mid-wall' shaft being itself corbelled out, this shaft is (3) made to support a stone slab, or 'through-stone,' which is long enough to take the whole thickness of the wall. This through-stone is not a capital, for the shaft often has its own capital of the normal square plan under the slab, though it sometimes sustains the slab without the interposition of any capital.

A different method is (4) recessing. This which occurs in advanced Romanesque generally was specially favoured by the Normans, and was only employed occasionally by the Saxons and in work presumably late. We find it in doorways, tower arches, and chancel arches, and a word will be said about the feature on a subsequent page (p. 397 f.) in connection with the question of 'overlap.' Here we are specially concerned with window openings in which, as just explained, the thickness of the wall is brought down by successive steps till it is reduced to a width correspondent to the abacus of an ordinary capital, and when this recessing occurs in windows in English buildings they may generally be ascribed to Norman or later date. In some English belfries which have been assigned to a pre-Conquest date, but are really Early Norman, there is a curious compromise. Recessing is not adopted, and the whole width of the aperture is spanned by a single arch passing through the whole thickness of the wall. An apparent division is however made by inserting a sort of frontispiece in the form of a shaft carrying two subsidiary arches on the external face of the wall. This is done in the magnificent Early Norman tower at Eaton Bishop, Herefordshire, and it occurs also at Burwash, Sussex ;

Tugby, Leicestershire ; and Wendens Ambo, Essex—all structures for which a Saxon origin has been too hastily claimed. The compromise shows that these particular masons did not understand this device for the structural division of the unrecessed opening. Fig. 98 shows some examples of these diverse methods of treatment.

On the historical relations of these methods it may be safely said that the corbel cap (Fig. 97) originated in Italy where we find it in the numerous towers of comparatively early date at Rome and Ravenna, and that it spread from Italy to Central Europe. That Italy exercised an influence in this matter over the Rhine provinces is only what we should expect.

Many doubtful theories have been put forward in architectural books about the influence of one Romanesque district upon another, but the connection of N Italy and the Rhineland is not to be gainsaid. Lisenen in quite a German form occur on the façade of San Zeno at Verona of the beginning of the twelfth century, while the resemblance between the decorative arcading so common in North Italy and Tuscany, as on the W fronts of the cathedrals of Parma, Lucca, or Pisa, and the dwarf galleries in the upper stages of German Romanesque buildings, is too close to allow of a doubt that there is historical connection between the regions. The use of columns indicates that the influence passed from Italy to Germany and not in the reverse direction, for Italy is the land of the column, and the presumption is that any tradition of the employment of the column would have there its origin. It is quite possible that this same Italian connection accounts for the extensive use of the column in general, as an architectural feature, in Germany as compared with France. In Germany, far more frequently than elsewhere in the North, we find the column utilized in nave arcades, either in place of, or alternately with, the pier, and it is to be noticed also that the German columns so employed sometimes exhibit in distinct and even exaggerated shapes the classical entasis and taper.

This particular form of the subdivided opening originates therefore in Italy and was conveyed from there to the Rhine-




FIG. 98, Methods of dividing a double opening.

- I. Corbel cap on mid-wall shaft, Sta. Pudentiana, Rome. [Italy, IX.]
- II. Do., S. Apollinare in Classe, Ravenna. [Italy, VII or VIII.]
- III. Moulded through-stone over cap of mid-wall shaft, Church of Hoven, in Rhenish Prussia. [Germany, XII.]
- IV. Corbel cap on mid-wall shaft, Jarrow, Durham. [England, XI.]
- V. Do., west front of Trier. [Germany, XI.]
- VI. Do., Sompting Church, Sussex. [England, XI.]
- VII. Division apparent only. [English-Norman, XI.]
- VIII. Recessing. [Norman, XII.]

land, and it will be made apparent in the sequel that this region transmitted it at a later day to Anglo-Saxon England.

For the other form of opening of which there is here question it is fairly easy to fix the place of origin as Italy, and it is specially characteristic of Germany and of pre-Conquest Britain. This is the so-called double splayed window, in which the aperture for light is at or near the centre of the thickness of the wall, and the jambs are sloped away towards the outer faces.

The Early Christian basilicas at Rome and Ravenna, and

wherever else they are sufficiently preserved, possess large windows cut through walls that in Italy at any rate are comparatively thin. Hence they are either driven in classical fashion straight through the walls, or else are very slightly splayed on the interior. Later on in early mediaeval times the apertures for light were considerably narrowed, and as the walls were as a rule correspondingly thickened, some kind of splaying to assist the diffusion of light was rendered necessary. This was accomplished in two ways, the most common method being to locate the aperture in the outer face of the wall and splay the jambs and sill toward the interior. This method is exemplified in French work generally, and is universal in the Norman Duchy. It is used also in a Carolingian work of great historical importance, the church erected by the famous Eginhard early in the ninth century at Michelstadt in the Odenwald in Germany. Here the church is lighted by round headed and by circular openings all widely splayed on the interior, and for the small windows in churches like Michelstadt of a modest size, we may take this form to have been at the time normal in all the Carolingian realms.

About this epoch however, the alternative arrangement of the double splay makes its appearance. The exact history of the feature has never been made out but like the subdivided belfry opening and the Lisenen it was doubtless derived originally from Italy. According to Rivoira the first datable appearance of it there is in the church at Bagnacavallo near Ravenna of VI.¹ Venturi gives this date also and mentions the windows 'a doppio sguancio.'² N of the Alps it is found in the lower stage of the rotunda at Fulda of about 820, but Rivoira says that the double splayed lights here are not original, and that the early work at Gernrode of the last part of X contains the first dated German examples.³ The

¹ *Lombardic Architecture*, 1, 92.

² *Storia dell' Arte Italiana*, Milan, 1902, II, 152 f

³ Rivoira, l.c., II, 299.

feature is exhibited in part of the crypt at the E end of Werden a. d. Ruhr, of IX, and in the N flanking turret of the W front of St Pantaleon, Cologne, of about 990 A.D. An example now blocked in the N wall of Bishop Meinwerk's Bartholomäus Kapelle to the N of the cathedral at Paderborn of early XI, brings us to the central Romanesque period when this feature becomes very common in the smaller openings of German churches. An example from the W front of Trier of the middle of XI is shown in plan in Fig. 99.

In this double splayed window accordingly we can see another peculiarity of the E province, for Norman architecture is innocent of it, while by its occurrence in the pre-Conquest work of our own country it provides another point of attachment by which we can associate our later Anglo-Saxon building with the Rhineland and Saxony.



FIG. 99, Plan of double splayed window, west front, at Trier.

(4) In the matter of details, the first point is the characteristic forms of capital used in the two provinces.

Carolingian architecture either employed ancient Roman caps as in most instances at Aachen, or else imitations of antique corinthian or composite capitals executed sometimes with no little care. Some of the best of these are to be found on the little Thorhalle at Lorsch. The same imitation of classical models continued, and in the vestibule at Corvey of IX, the W building at Werden of the beginning, and Essen of the end, of X, and the Bartholomäus Kapelle at Paderborn of the early part of XI, we find elaborate but more rudely executed reproductions of the same models.

From XI onwards the place of honour among capitals in the Rhineland and surrounding regions, especially towards N, is assumed by the so-called cubical cap, produced by the intersection of a cube and a sphere of diameter equal to its

diagonal. It is thus in plan square at the top so as to correspond with the square piece of wall between two arches that it has to carry, and of circular plan below in accordance with the cylindrical shape of the column it surmounts. As forming a simple and natural transition from the one to the other it fulfils, with an equally perfect aptitude, the same function as the ancient Greek Doric capital, and is really worthy as a tectonic form to be placed by its side. The origin and history of the cubical cap are obscure. Some have seen in it a direct derivation from woodwork.¹ This view has been combated by Dehio and von Bezold² and de Lasteyrie,³ but has been revived again recently by Josef Strzygowski.⁴ On this theory it would belong to the North, but its appearance in VI at Constantinople is quite sufficient to vindicate for it on the contrary an origin in masonry in classical lands. The reference is to its use in the famous cistern of 1001 columns, Bin bir Derek, formed by Justinian in 528, where it occurs in a quite normal shape.⁵ Whether it spread thence to W Europe, or, as Dehio thinks, was there evolved in different independent centres,⁶ may be questioned, but it is in favour of the latter view that we find in so many regions tentative endeavours to bring the top square of a cubical mass down to a round at its base, endeavours that would hardly have been made if the true and quite simple solution of the problem had been known and recognized. Rivoira makes the cap a Lombard invention imparted to the northern peoples,⁷ but it is against this that it does not appear

¹ Humann in the *Bonner Jahrbücher*, Heft 89, 1889, p. 192, and Ruprich Robert, *Architecture Normande*, 1, 175.

² *Kirchliche Baukunst*, 1, 681.

³ *Architecture Religieuse*, p. 612.

⁴ *Origin of Christian Church Art*, Oxford, 1923, p. 234.

⁵ Photographically reproduced in *Wonders of the Past*, Fleetway House, London, 1924, 11, p. 898.

⁶ *Kirchliche Baukunst*, 1, 682.

⁷ He terms it always 'the Lombardic cubico-spherical capital.' *Lombardic Architecture*, 11, ch. vi, Eng. Trans.

early in S Germany, nor is it ever characteristic of that region but rather of the Rhineland and Saxony. The Italian writer himself believes that the first appearance of the feature in Germany is at St Michael, Hildesheim, in the northern part of the land.¹ This would be in XI, but the most recent statement on this vexed question is that of Dehio, in vol. v of the *Handbuch der Deutschen Kunstdenkmäler*,² who says that the 'Westbau' of the minster at Essen of X contains the earliest datable German cubical capital.

This means of course the feature in its fully developed form. The tentative endeavours just spoken of are in evidence at many times and places from the Late-Roman period downwards. Some Roman caps from the fort at Barr Hill on the Antonine Vallum now in the Hunterian Museum, Glasgow, are early specimens of a large collection that may be sampled in many regions both N and S of the Alps in the early mediaeval centuries. In X and XI there are examples in the Wiperti-crypt at Quedlinburg, the crypt of the Rotunda at St Bénigne, Dijon, the galleries of the nave at Gernrode, the transepts of St Remi at Rheims, and also in Normandy at Jumièges. The caps here, to be illustrated later on, Fig. 193, no. 5, with two similar ones in the undercroft of the dormitory at Westminster, are however about the only examples in Norman work up to the Conquest or a little beyond of anything like the cubical capital, which up to then is not characteristic of the Duchy. Until XII indeed it is sparingly found in the Neustrian province, and in an article on the scalloped cap in a French publication Mr John Bilson says 'le chapiteau cubique n'est pas en Normandie le type normal de la seconde moitié du XI^{me} siècle.'³ The characteristic Early Norman cap is the debased Ionic or volute cap, excellently represented in the crypt of Ste.-Trinité (Abbaye aux

¹ *Lombardic Architecture*, II, 294.

² Berlin, 1912, p. 122.

³ 'Le Chapiteau à Godrons en Angleterre,' in the *Compte Rendu du LXXXV^{me} Congrès Archéologique de France*, 1908.

Dames) at Caen, as well as in innumerable other buildings, and it is not till XII that the cubical cap becomes specifically Norman.

In Saxon architecture the cubical cap, as Rivoira has noticed, makes its appearance as surmounting, and in one piece with, the baluster shafts in the upper opening in the W wall at Brixworth, Fig. 106, a feature which has been ascribed (p. 113) to the restoration of the church in X after the Danish destruction. It cannot be said that the form becomes common in the later Anglo-Saxon period. The only detached columns proper that survive from this period are those at Repton and here the caps, while rather carefully wrought and even enriched, are from the morphological point of view of the crudest possible description, for, as will be seen in the drawing, Fig. 144, A, the square of the abacus is reduced by a hollow chamfer to a smaller square below, but there is no attempt to bring the square base of the cap into any relation with the circular top of the shaft. The terminations of the numerous baluster shafts in openings are as a rule of a nondescript order until we come to the mid-wall shafts of the very late Anglo-Saxon belfry towers, where numerous rather elaborate capitals occur, the relations of which with Norman or other continental work open up special questions that must be discussed on later pages occupied with what has been called the 'Saxo-Norman overlap.' For future treatment also must be reserved certain capitals surmounting attached shafts in somewhat advanced work that occurs in a group of churches the architectural position of which is hard to fix. This work, seen for example at Langford, Oxon; Hadstock, Essex; Great Paxton, Hunts., is not Norman in character but at the same time seems very advanced for purely Saxon production even of the middle of XI.

There is one form of capital or rather impost that is distinctively Saxon and that may be singled out as an early and

also a persistent motive. This is composed of thin superimposed slabs that may at first have been re-used Roman bricks, which we find so employed at the springing of arches at St Pancras and St Martin, Canterbury, and at Brixworth, Fig. 36. The most conspicuous use of the motive is to be found in the imposts of the noble tower arch at Barnack, Northamptonshire, and it will be convenient to connect the necessary notice of the motive in general with this outstanding example of it which is illustrated in the next chapter (p. 281).

The examination of architectural details on which we are engaged brings us now to a feature already mentioned, the characteristic Saxon peculiarity of the long and short quoin, the development of which there is good reason to ascribe to this intermediate period. There is no sign of it in any of the early buildings already passed in review, but in the Third Period, beginning in the second half of X, it appears fully formed and in common though not universal use. It is a native product evolved as we have seen (p. 55) from the jambs of openings treated in the Escomb fashion, but we are not able to discern it, so to say, in the making, save possibly in the case of Heddon-on-the-Wall, see (p. 458). It is a fact easily to be understood that something like this arrangement of upright and flat pieces in alternation may occur accidentally in rough stone buildings of any period. In stone-building Scotland it would not be difficult to find many examples like this from an XVIII ruined structure near Edinburgh, Fig. 100. This should make us cautious in basing a claim for Saxon date on casual bits that look like l. and s. work in the quoins of old churches. L. and s. work to be called by that name should be quite clear and definite, and only when it passes this test should it be ranked as evidence. Hence it would be dangerous to say of any quoin that exhibits what is vaguely termed 'long and short feeling' that it is l. and s. 'in the making.' The appearance may be

accidental and devoid of chronological significance. L. and s. stone setting, when it is distinct and unmistakable, is on the other hand an excellent Saxon criterion, for, so far as the writer's knowledge extends, it is never used in the Duchy nor indeed, for quoins, anywhere on the Continent.¹ There are however instances in Germany, as for example on the W part of St Pantaleon at Cologne, of X, where the l. and s. technique is used for wall pilasters after a fashion illustrated in Fig. 94. In connection with what is called here the Saxo-Norman overlap dealt with in the latter part of this volume, there must be noted certain clear cases of its occasional survival in Norman work in England, the most conspicuous case being Cholsey in Berkshire (p. 426).




FIG. 100, Accidental l. and s. quoining.

Another characteristic Late Saxon detail is like l. and s. quoins linked on to earlier work but appears later in distinctive forms different from those found in the VII group of churches. This is the baluster shaft, used already in VII, conspicuous in the later work at Brixworth, at Barton-on-Humber, at Earls Barton, all probably of the latter part of X, and continuing in active service till quite the latest Anglo-Saxon period, and even after the Conquest.

The earlier turned baluster shafts at the W opening of the porch at Monkwearmouth have been already illustrated (p. 124) and attention has been drawn to the delicacy and finish with which the material, a magnesian limestone, has

¹ Dr Nils Åberg of Upsala has been kind enough to make inquiries of architectural experts in the North, and it is found that neither l. and s. nor big stone quoins are recognized Scandinavian forms.

been worked. It is another instance of super-excellence in a particular kind of artistic or technical work making its appearance at an early stage in its life history. These porch shafts are only the best specimens of a class represented fairly largely in the North. At Monkwearmouth, at Jarrow, and in Durham cathedral library, there exist whole or in fragments nearly fifty similar shafts of the same type but varying in the distribution of the projections and hollows. Specimens of the score or more of them in Jarrow N porch are shown in the upper and undermost rows on the process plate, Fig. 101, while the centre row shows some that are preserved in the vestry at Monkwearmouth. As regards the use of them it has been suggested that they formed part of the choir enclosures in the churches where they have been found; but, on the other hand, we have noted some still in their original position at Monkwearmouth, inserted in the jambs of the window openings in the W wall of the nave (p. 127). If this be the way they were used, the number found at the two churches would pretty well correspond to the number of the windows. Shafts of this particular kind seem not to have come to light anywhere else in our own country, save at Hart in County Durham, nor are examples signalized from the Continent. The writer has searched in vain for their prototypes in Italy and N Gaul, the two sources from which the builders of these churches by Wear and Tyne are supposed to have drawn their inspiration. The bold though often clumsy carving of Gallo-Roman and Merovingian origin exhibits nothing that is similar. Continental parallels to this earliest type of our Saxon shafts are apparently non-existent, though, as we shall see, the later types of Saxon balusters can more or less be mated abroad.

It has been seen (p. 59) that small shafts turned in the lathe represent a form of Roman work which the Saxons found in the country, and a Roman suggestion presumably underlies this curious form of our native work, but it must







FIG. 101, Baluster shafts from Jarrow and Monkwearmouth.

(To face p. 258.)



be confessed that these shafts in the North are in profile quite unlike anything we find in classical architecture. The existing Roman shafts of small size found in this country as a rule exhibit the three parts of the normal column—base, shaft, and capital. The base and capital may be worked into any number of mouldings, and the neck may be similarly treated, but the main divisions of the whole are not really obscured. Fig. 32 gives an example that is germane to the present subject as it actually occurs in the belfry open-




FIG. 102, Detail from Roman altar at Birrens, Dumfriesshire.

ing of a Saxon church tower at Wickham, Berks. This shaft is straight-sided and normally treated, but Roman examples of ruder workmanship, such as Fig. 33, sometimes show the distinct bellying which we shall find characteristic of later Saxon baluster shafts. For shafts of this later kind there are also Roman prototypes on a small scale used decoratively on sculptured stones, such as altars. For example, on a Roman altar found not long ago at Birrens, Dumfriesshire, on the Scottish side of the great Wall, we find the detail shown in Fig. 102, where in the centre of the front a round

headed niche is flanked by two supports that evidently represent such balusters. A small Roman altar from Lanchester, in the cathedral library at Durham, exhibits a niche flanked in the same manner. These upright shafts, represented as used constructively, must be distinguished from similar motives, strung together in a sort of beading, and used to form continuous lines of enrichment, as on the Birrens altar, on each side of the niche in Fig. 102. It is probably incorrect to speak of these as 'rows of balusters.' They are really forms of the astragal ornament, though the elements of the pattern may at times have been influenced in form by baluster shafts. In a Roman stone built into the north wall of the north passage of



FIG. 103, Astragal on Roman stone at Hexham.

Wilfrid's crypt at Hexham, there is an astragal of a simple type (Fig. 103), and the Birrens beading would be much the same, only that in the middle, at the thickest part,

each bead is either cut in two or marked with a nick, it is not easy to say which. Now these same forms of supporting baluster and of beading occur in undoubtedly Saxon stones, many characteristic examples of which are in the Durham library collection. Fig. 104 shows one of several fragments found on the site of the nave of Wilfrid's church at Hexham, and there is some reason to believe that these formed part of its enrichment. Here distinct balusters occur as




FIG. 104, Carved stone, with balusters, from the site of Wilfrid's church at Hexham.

ornamental motives, while there are other stones in the same collection with Saxon carving on them, which show forms of the beading above noticed. On a well known stone in the porch of Jarrow church (Fig. 105) there is a row of little balusters, about $3\frac{1}{2}$ in. high, set upright, but curiously similar in shape,

if we look at them in one way, to the elements of the horizontal beading on the Birrens altar. With these little balusters which seem to be in two pieces may be compared a single shaft carved on a recently discovered Roman tombstone at York where it forms one of the legs of a couch represented in low relief, Fig. 116. Another older specimen in the Hospitium shows similar shafts. The Roman carver would probably not have represented these baluster shafts as used constructively unless such features had




FIG. 105, Carved stone in porch of Jarrow Church.

been employed in real life, though nothing exactly like them may have been found on Roman sites. In Saxon work they are not only represented in ornament but actually occur used constructively in buildings.

This constructive use is chiefly found in connection with the subdivided openings spoken of a page or two ago (p. 246 f.) for the mid-wall shaft that supports the through-stone often takes the form of a baluster. This Saxon baluster in its later shape should probably be regarded as a native product, evolved like the l. and s. quoin from forms primarily Roman, though as a fact baluster shafts, sometimes banded, sometimes with bellying outlines, do occasionally occur in early Romanesque work on the Continent. The continental examples are however found rather in the western than in the eastern of the two provinces the distinction between which has been explained (p. 231). In Germany, partly owing to Italian influence, small shafts are as a rule of classical plainness and classical contour, but in the Loire district banded balusters of X or XI make their appearance, as on

the façade of the early church of St Mesme at Chinon, while the old church of St Pierre at Jumièges in Normandy, of X, has them in its triforium gallery openings. Examples of this kind are however sporadic, whereas in England they are one of the characteristic features of the later Saxon style, and we may regard them quite as our own. At Brixworth, Barton-on-Humber, and Earls Barton, we find them agreeing




FIG. 106, Baluster shaft in opening in W wall of Brixworth church.




FIG. 107, Baluster shafts, A, at Barton-on-Humber, B, at Earls Barton.

in general aspect, and can see that they are wrought with some pains though very different in execution from the earlier set of VII. If we are right in assigning the openings in the W end of the nave at Brixworth to the revival of X this will help to give a date to the other buildings in which shafts of this same form and same technical execution occur.¹ The Brixworth shafts, of reddish sandstone, Fig. 106—their position is shown in the interior view Fig. 52—are 4 ft. 10 in.

¹ Quite recently, 1924, a fragment of a shaft of this type has been reported from the excavations on the site of the Saxon monastery at Whitby, Yorks.

high and are noteworthy as possessing caps and bases of the orthodox 'cubical capital' form, though it is doubtful whether this shape is not rather accidental and devoid of the significance which Rivoira accords to it (p. 255). Fig. 107, A gives us a baluster shaft from Barton-on-Humber and Fig. 107, B one from Earls Barton. These have a distinct family likeness and agree in that they are not like the earlier Monkwearmouth-Jarrow examples formed on the lathe, but cut to shape by strokes of the pick or chisel. In the case of the Brixworth shafts a close examination shows that they have been hewn to shape not turned, for the marks of the pick are quite visible, and some of the shafts in Earls Barton tower, those that divide the openings on the belfry stage, Fig. 124, are not even round but are oblong in plan and only equipped with the mouldings on their outer faces. It is curious how the character of these harks back to the small Roman models shown a page or two back, though the technique of them is not Roman.

Of simpler form and apparently of later date are balusters like that which occurs as a mid-wall shaft in the E opening of the nave at Wing, Bucks, Fig. 108. The form of the cap and base as well as of the impost on the jamb may be noted for future reference. Still simpler is Fig. 109 from one of the double openings in the S face of the Late Saxon tower at Bardsey near Leeds (p. 191), and the quite plain bellying shaft from the double opening in the nave wall at Worth, Sussex, to which parallels can be easily found in Late Saxon W towers.¹ This was given in Fig. 14. Worth is late in the style, though the shape of the baluster is curiously like one particular form of the Roman shafts previously referred to (p. 59), that look like the supports of floors in chambers with hypocaust arrangements. One at Chesters, on the N Tyne, measures 2 ft. 2 in. in height and swells from a diameter at each end of about 5 in. to a middle thickness of nearly 9 in.

¹ There is one in the round W tower at E Lexham, Norfolk.

The resemblance of these Late Saxon shafts to Roman ones is probably a coincidence. Worth at any rate is far enough away from Roman sites, as it lies in the heart of the old Andredesweald.

There still remains one important class of baluster shafts that are not easy to locate or explain. These are rather slender in build and somewhat elaborately moulded by the process of turning on the lathe. The best known are a set of eight shafts about 4 ft. to 5 ft. high in the E triforium openings of the transepts at St Albans, figured in Neale's and in




FIG. 108, Mid-wall baluster shaft from Wing, Bucks.



FIG. 109, Shaft from Bardsey, near Leeds.

Buckler's works on the abbey church, that are supposed to be part of the material collected for the rebuilding of this by abbot Aldred at the end of X and ultimately used by the Norman abbot soon after the Conquest, a series of plain ones being added to make up the number required. They are in no instance all in one piece but are made up of short lengths averaging about 30 in., which are joined as shown in the examples chosen for illustration Fig. 110. Some of the mouldings are made up with plaster, and the whole work presents a somewhat makeshift appearance consistent with the theory that they were survivals from an older edifice or from an old store of building material. They stand now on Norman bases, and the caps on them are of the Norman

cushion type like the one specimen shown. A date as early as the end of VIII has been suggested,¹ but the shafts should be taken with others that must be much later, see below. The stone is Barnack, but a similar oolite furnished the Norman additions, and all may have come from the Roman city.

Several fragmentary shafts of the same kind are to be




FIG. 110, Turned shafts from the triforium of the Abbey Church of St Albans.

seen in the museum at Dover, Fig. 111, and an account of them is given in ch. v of the Rev. John Puckle's *Church and Fortress of Dover Castle*.² The fragments all came from the interior of the Saxon cruciform church to be noticed in the sequel (p. 353) and were found together near the SW angle of the central tower, where they appeared to have formed 'parts of some work in the interior of the church' belonging perhaps to 'a heavy stone screen.' One of the pieces was re-used at a later time and has part of an Early English

¹ *Monument Reports*, Herts, p. 10.

² Oxford, 1864.

moulding cut in it. The material is Caen stone, and the lengths are in no cases greater than that of the sections at St Albans.

Quite recently some fragments of turned shafts of the same kind and apparently

the same material have come to light in the operations at St Augustine, Canterbury. Plain shafts of Caen stone made up of similar sections occur in the mid-wall work in the belfry openings of St Mary Coslaney, Norwich, in association with details of Norman character, and, on the whole, shafts in sections, of plain or moulded profiles, of Caen or similar stone, prepared in the lathe, look more like very late Saxon work than work of X, though they




FIG. 111, Fragments of baluster shafts in Museum at Dover.

cannot well be associated with the Saxo-Norman overlap, since they do not occur in contemporary Norman work in the Duchy. The whole subject of Saxon baluster shafts would repay further investigation.

CHAPTER X

THE REVIVAL OF THE TENTH CENTURY AND THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE THIRD PERIOD

GLANCING BACK at the repertory of new forms which the builders of Period C will have at their command we note that some are of native provenance while others had their origin in the Rhineland and Saxony. Of the first the most important are the l. and s. quoins and the baluster shafts, which are a Roman heritage transmitted through the intermediate Viking Period B, and the strip-work round openings. The other innovations such as the pilaster strips, and the double splayed windows are importations from the Continent, and it is probable that when the movement of ecclesiastical reform began in the days of Edgar the Saxon builders had already some familiarity with the new features, which were accordingly available when the revived religious spirit of the times was ready to express itself in monumental forms. In itself the reform under Edgar was not inspired from Germany but rather from the monastic centres of the Neustrian province, such as St Benoît-sur-Loire (Fleury) and Blandinium by Ghent (represented there now by the church of St Pierre). Centres such as these would certainly not have furnished strip-work round openings, pilasters, or double splayed windows, but we do however learn that Blandinium possessed in X a church with a W tower¹ which brings it into connection with our Anglo-Saxon plans, while St Benoît-sur-Loire possesses now the lower stories of a fine Romanesque W tower of XII, figured by de Lasteyrie on his p. 392.

¹ Van de Putte, *Annales Blandinienses*, Ghent, 1842, ad ann. 979.

The conditions of this great revival of the last part of X have been indicated in a previous volume,¹ and what it might be expected to mean for architecture may be judged from what was said at the time about the new church at Ramsey Abbey, that 'compared with the old-fashioned method of building which had before prevailed it was a structure of no mean pretension.' It was dedicated in 974. An account of the building operations preserved in the Chronicle of Ramsey² is instructive as showing what would be aimed at in an important abbey church at this period of revival. The decision to erect a fine church upon this site in the Fens was arrived at in the summer of 968 and 'all through the following winter they are getting together all that the forethought of the masons demanded, whether in tools of iron or tools of wood, and everything else that seemed needful for the future building. At length when the winter is past, the storehouses are thrown open, the most skilled workmen available are brought together, and the length and width of the church which is to be built are measured out. The foundations are dug deep on account of the marshy character of the site, and the earth is beaten with many strokes of the rammer to solidify it for the support of the weight. The labourers, inspired as much by the warmth of their pious devotion as by the desire for pay, are instant with their toil; while some bring the stones others are mixing mortar, and a third party raises both stones and mortar aloft to the work by the aid of pulleys, and so with the help of the Lord the structure rises daily higher and higher.

'Two towers soared on high above the roofs, of which the lesser one was at the western end, on the front of the building, and offered from afar a stately spectacle to those entering the island; while the greater one, in the centre of the cruciform structure, stood upon four pillars which were

¹ Vol. I, 228 f., 245 f.

² *Chronicon Abbatiae Ramesiensis*, Rolls Series, no. 83, p. 38 f.

joined together pair and pair by arches thrown across from wing to wing to preserve the rigidity of the fabric.'

There is an additional notice of the same operations in a Life of Bishop Oswald of Worcester, the patron and inspirer of the work. It is there recounted how the bishop inaugurated the work of the church with the sign of the cross which is the pledge of our salvation, and how he accordingly began to construct the buildings on the site after the pattern of a cross. There was on the east on the south and on the north an arm of the cross (the Latin word is 'porticus' and the passage illustrates the wide usage of this term, see (p. 89)), and in the midst a tower which was sustained by these projecting parts. The church was then continued westward from the tower.¹

Time, ill-fortune, and the Normans accounted for all the greater Saxon churches that existed at the time of the Conquest, and we are unable to say how far the promise of Ramsey was fulfilled. Apart from literary records, about the only pieces of evidence for the aspect of some of the greater churches of the Third Period are two seals, one attached to an Exeter deed of 1133, figured and discussed by G. Oliver in his *Lives of the Bishops of Exeter*,² the other a seal attached to the MS. Cott. XII, 80, and two other MSS., in the Museum. It is numbered 1469 in the Catalogue of Seals, and supposed to represent the Saxon conventual church of St Peter at Chichester, to which the South Saxon see was transferred from Selsey in 1075. The Exeter seal, Fig. 112, shows two flanking towers, evidently not a pair, of which the S and lower one appears to be round, and the other square and furnished with a W doorway, while there is a pavilion




FIG. 112, Seal attached to an Exeter deed of 1133.

¹ *Historians of the Church of York*, Rolls Series, no. 71/1, p. 434.

² Exeter, 1861, Plate no. 14.

tower over the centre. This may represent the monastic church founded by Æthelstan and restored by Cnut about 1020 A.D., and would be in its towers an advance on Ramsey. The Chichester seal is shown in Fig. 113, from a drawing of the silver matrix, published in the *Antiquaries Journal* for July, 1923, and now in the British Museum.¹ It is difficult to derive from it any definite architectural information. It seems to show an aisleless church with apsidal (?) presbytery and a S door placed in the middle of the length of




FIG. 113, Matrix of Chichester Seal in British Museum, showing possibly a Saxon church.

the nave. This is terminated at W by a single round tower. Over the roof of the nave there appears a pavilion tower pyramidal in outline and with three stories. Such a feature occurs early in Christian architecture of the West,² and it survives as at Ely into post-Saxon times; it is familiar also in the Romanesque architecture of the Rhineland. It is only however in connection with cruciform structures that the feature possesses significance. On the Chichester seal its connection with the transeptless building is not clear, and it seems to appear from behind it rather than to surmount

¹ Thanks are due to the custodians of the piece for kind permission to have the drawing made.

² Reference may be made here to de Lasteyrie, pp. 88, 142, 382.

its roof. All that can be safely said is that the seal shows a building of some pretension but whether it dates from X or XI is uncertain.

An argument in favour of X Saxon architecture may be founded on the distinct impression of the monumental derived from the towers of certain churches of the town and village type which we have some reason to ascribe to this period of revival. They are Earls Barton and Barton-on-Humber, which have openings fitted with boldly cut baluster shafts of the second type (p. 261 f.),¹ and to these we may add the tower of Barnack, Northants. This does not exhibit balusters but agrees with the other two in a great display of the decorative pilaster strips, the above noted Austrasian feature that now makes a prominent appearance. The principle that has been followed in these volumes is that of favouring a comparatively early date for any specially good production in a particular genre or style, on the ground that it is more likely to come, so to say, at a burst, than as the outcome of a long period of plodding. Hence in the absence of any evidence of a decisive kind the dating of the examples of the Third Period, C, must to some extent depend on general considerations such as these, and the reader must not expect the sort of documented certainty that was in many cases attainable in Period A. The opinion of a noted authority on our early architecture, the late J. T. Micklethwaite, may be adduced in favour of the view above indicated. In an unpublished letter of 1886 to J. T. Irvine in the Irvine papers at Edinburgh he uses these words :—‘ I take it that if we are ever able to classify our Saxon work as we have our Gothic, it will be seen that the best works are the earliest, and the history is one of continual decay even to the time of Canute

¹ The balusters in the belfry stage at Earls Barton (p. 287) are not circular in section and are only worked on the front. In combination with the plain piers behind them they go back through the wall, as we saw was the case with the central pier of the double opening on the E tower face at Deerhurst (p. 214).

when there was some improvement.' In connection with the point here urged it must be remembered that the early part of X, with the century generally, represents a most flourishing era in the decorative arts as they were carried on in the so-called 'School of Winchester,' and in other centres. In a series of recent articles in the *Burlington Magazine* for 1923, Mr H. P. Mitchell of the Victoria and Albert Museum has brought this out, most notably in relation to the decoration of MSS. The article for June, 1923, brings together a number of important notices, and the fact may be emphasized that, in the famous embroideries from St Cuthbert's coffin preserved at Durham, Winchester products of about 910, we have works as far surpassing the ordinary level of mediæval textiles as the Gospels of Lindisfarne surpassed the book decoration of its time. In the latter part of VII notable activity in architecture accompanied this great development of decorative skill, and so too in X we have a right to look for ambitious architectural works in correspondence with the decorative achievements.¹

There are historical considerations that point in the same direction. It is a significant fact attested by the episcopal lists given in Stubbs's *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*, that certain bishoprics were in abeyance during parts of the centuries of Danish ravage, and were reconstituted in the time of Edgar. The revival of the bishopric meant of course the rebuilding or restoration of the episcopal church, and considerable constructive activity in the parishes round about. In the same reign also the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* tells us (ad ann. 963) that Æthelwold of Winchester begged of King Edgar 'all the monasteries which the heathen had formerly destroyed, because he wished to restore them : and the King cheerfully granted it.' This points to extensive works of

¹ It is a point of interest which has historical significance to note the appearance of architectural motives on coins of Edward the Elder. These will be discussed in a succeeding volume.

church restoration which mark this as a great building epoch.

At the same time it is not pretended here for a moment that the comparatively early works in Period C are the only ones that really count. It is sufficient to note the noble transepts and tower arches at Stow, Lincolnshire, of 1040, and the ambitious 'central' church started at St Augustine, Canterbury, about 1050 (p. 87), to show that no such idea can be maintained. Fine buildings in fact are not necessarily late or necessarily early, but are often surprisingly early.

Granting then that Earls Barton tower is a monument of X, its massive proportions and lordly aspect would suggest a church suitable for a great abbey or a bishop's see. A comparison with the tower at Barton-on-Humber, a similar though less imposing structure, shows the danger of such an inference, for at Barton the tower, so to say, *is* the church and the rest of the plan gives us only a small chancel to E and a W adjunct of about the same size. The towers in themselves with the addition of Barnack are however of much interest and they exhibit some of the new features of the later period in striking forms and in full profusion, as would be likely if these features were novel ones. It is this fact combined with their size and general excellence that has given them their place here as monuments of the revival of X. In the case of Barnack tower there are decorative details from which may be drawn some indications of date. One of the most important of these from the present point of view is a projecting animal's head, or *πρόκροστος*, over the head of a window on the W face, in which feature we are reminded of Deerhurst. Other details consist in part of stone slabs ornamented with pierced work that as *transennae* fill three window apertures on the tower faces. There is in two of these an interlacing pattern in which complete rings occur, Fig. 114, and this motive is distinctively Norse occurring on English carved stones in the N counties after the great

Danish invasions of the latter part of IX. There are also three upright slabs carved in relief that are placed above the first cornice on the tower in the centre of the N, W, and S faces. The carving here is of a very remarkable character as will be seen in the drawings, Fig. 115. If the too fastidious critic to whom all Saxon work is barbarous be inclined to stint at the Deerhurst hood moulds and to pronounce them





FIG. 114, Pierced mid-wall slab at Barnack, Northants. From a drawing by J. T. Irvine.

Norman, with still greater assurance would he assign these foliage designs at the earliest to XII. Mr J. T. Irvine tells us in his *Barnack Notes*¹ that at first he took this view and assumed that these later slabs had been inserted *après coup* in the walls of the tower, which he considered as a fabric to be Saxon. A close technical examination however convinced him that they were parts of the original structure and he seems to have fully accepted their Saxon provenance. In 1924 the present writer carefully examined the slabs on the N and S faces that are accessible from the roof of the nave and aisles and is entirely of Irvine's opinion. On the S side which is best seen the carved

slab, B, in Fig. 115, is in the centre and is flanked with two window openings which are obviously of the date of the fabric. These three features come above the topmost member of the cornice that separates the first and second stories of the tower, and each has below it a horizontal stone 6 or 8 in. high that serves as a sort of plinth for it. In the case of the two windows this forms their sill and is of course contemporary with them, but the plinth under the central

¹ Among the Irvine papers at Edinburgh.






FIG. 115, Carved slabs on Barnack Church tower.

The small insets (a) and (b) show birds from Saxon cross-shafts of about IX or X.

carved slab is equally contemporary, and as a fact on the S face this plinth seen in B is in exactly the same material weathered in precisely the same fashion as the topmost member of the cornice on which it rests. There is no doubt that the three carved slabs like the pierced transennae are parts of the original fabric.

Regarding first the transenna, Fig. 114, we shall probably be right in referring the peculiar and exotic technique to Italian models. The journey to Rome was often undertaken alike by laymen and by ecclesiastics of means and position. King Alfred's father Æthelwulf went there twice. In the churches of the peninsula the pierced marble slab was a familiar decorative detail and the Barnack pieces may be a home-made imitation of what had been seen abroad, the decorative motive being of course Dano-Saxon and unclassical. In the case of the carved foliage in relief, it will be noticed that B and C in Fig. 115 exhibit the peculiarity that the side sprays from the conventional foliage stem are bound in to the uprights of the framing on each side. This suggests a reminiscence of metal work in the form of bronze or iron grilles used in churches for purposes such as that of partly closing the opening of a hagioscope. The foliage is evidently based on the old vine motive, and there are obvious bunches of grapes in A and C while the old sheaths at the bifurcations have left their traces. The actual leaves however show the influence of the Carolingian acanthus. Each panel is surmounted by a bird, a recognizable element in Anglian ornamentation as we find it on the carved stones. The birds introduced as insets in Fig. 115 from stones at (a) Brompton, (b) Kirk Levington, Yorks., are quite of the same kind. The slender bird on the N face, A, appears again in the spandrels formed by a square hood mould (compare the upper opening on the W face of Deerhurst tower, Fig. 84) over the r. h. opening on the S side at Barnack above the S doorway into the tower. This opening is of course

an original feature and confirms the early dating of the carved slabs. Above the horizontal line on the sundial on this same S side there are sprays of foliage like some on the carved slabs, and it may be noted in passing that similar leafage appears on the sundial at Corhampton, Hants, a Third-Period church, Fig. 116, A. There is nothing therefore in these external decorative details at Barnack to forbid its inclusion among the monuments which in their vigour and





FIG. 116, A, Enriched Saxon sundial from Corhampton, Hants ;
B, Roman baluster shaft from relief at York.

originality may be regarded as signaling the revival of the latter part of X.

It must be admitted that a point of difficulty emerges when we remark that there are several carved fragments of cross shafts or similar Saxon stones built into the tower walls both inside and out. This is of course in itself strong presumptive evidence of a late, one would say normally a post-Conquest, date, and may be held to override such indications of an early epoch in Period C as the remarkable impost of the tower arch, Fig. 120, or the more general features which have led to the association of the tower with the revival of X. The use of such fragments as building material is generally



Barnack: Ch. Tower.




FIG. 117, Barnack Tower, from SW.

put down to the characteristic Norman callousness, but it occurs in the tower at Billingham, Durham (p. 444), which is certainly Saxon though late in the style, as well as at Beechamwell, Norfolk, where there are l. and s. quoins, and we do not of course know the various local conditions under which such a thing may have taken place. The Danes may very possibly have broken up the carved stones of the churchyard so drastically as to render them useless except for building material. At any rate, in spite of the phenomenon now recorded the tower has been grouped here with the others mentioned with it.

The tower, Fig. 117¹ and Fig. 118, measures externally in width 26 ft. 6 in. and the Saxon work is preserved for a height of c. 65 ft. above which it is crowned with an Early English spire. This Saxon work is in two main stories divided at about the height of the present nave roof by a cornice of early appearance the cross-section of which is of some interest and is shown in Fig. 121. A similar cornice terminates the upper story of less elevation with a clock on its S face. The quoins in this upper part are in l. and s. work of greater regularity than is seen below, and the faces of the tower on the N, S, and W sides are divided into four panels by vertical pilaster strips which, characteristically, do not start from the ground as buttresses would but from projecting corbel stones. One on the S face starts, as no buttress ever started, from the extrados of the doorway of entrance to the tower, a well-constructed opening cut straight through the thickness of




FIG. 118, Plan of Barnack Tower.

¹ This illustration, reduced from a drawing by J. T. Irvine, has by the kind permission of the Council of the British Archaeological Association, been copied from *Ass.*, 1899, p. 13.

the wall and flanked with vertical strips which correspond with a hood mould above, which however starts from its own




FIG. 119. View from nave into ground story of Barnack Tower. More modern interior structures are ignored.

projecting corbel stones. As at Deerhurst so here, there are numerous openings both in the form of doorways and of

windows with round or triangular heads, the latter internally splayed. Several of the openings are blocked.

The main interest of the tower resides in its internal arrangements,¹ Figs. 118, 119. It opens towards the nave by an arch 13 ft. wide and 20 ft. high excellently constructed with through-stones for voussoirs and enriched with flanking vertical pilasters that, interrupted only by the main impost, run on into a similar square sectioned hood mould, thus forming the characteristic feature that has been dubbed 'strip-work round openings,' and on the genesis of which a conjecture has already been offered (p. 225). This main impost is a feature so remarkable that it is given by itself in Fig. 120 in a sketch founded on a drawing by J. T. Irvine who devoted so much attention to this church. It appears to be made up of layers of numerous flat slabs, but these are really cut out of three superimposed stone blocks in laborious fashion, and the work exemplifies




FIG. 120, Impost of Barnack Tower arch.

that quaint abnormality in taste to which the Saxon constructor so often surrenders himself. The fact that a sort of camouflage of superimposed tiles or flat slabs has been painfully superinduced on massive stones, that would naturally call for that monumental treatment which the Saxon builder knew so well how to give to his quoins and other parts of his fabric,² is a proof that what we have

¹ These have been altered in mediaeval times by various encumbering structures of the date of the spire.

² As for example in the imposts of the chancel arch at Wittering, a few miles away, Fig. 186.

called the 'step-pattern' appealed especially to the Saxon taste. In his monumental work on Teutonic ornamentation, Riks-Antikvarie Bernhard Salin notices this step-pattern as in frequent use on decorated fibulae and other articles of tomb furniture of the pagan period, and explains the appearance of it in early Irish illuminated MSS. such as the Book of Durrow as due to Teutonic influence. We find it in use in various connections in Saxon buildings of all the periods, and this seems to be one of the rare instances in which a distinct Saxon predilection in ornament inherited from pagan times is carried into architectural work.

The step form appears first in a quite natural shape in the imposts on the W arch of the W porch at St Pancras and the 'priest's door' in the S wall of the chancel at St Martin, Canterbury, Fig. 121, 1, where they are made of two superimposed Roman bricks. Three bricks perform the same function at Brixworth, Fig. 36. This arrangement is reproduced at a much later date at Wing, both in the E opening shown Fig. 108 and in the N and S nave arcades, where we have the forms 4 and 5 in Fig. 121. The imposts in the tower opening at Deerhurst, Fig. 86, have the same motive, and so in a ruder form have those at Somerford Keynes, Fig. 75. On the very late, perhaps post-Conquest, axial tower at Langford, Oxon, the pilaster strips start on a string course with a single-stepped base, and end under the string course above marking the next story with a triple stepped capital, 7 in Fig. 121, and the same stepping occurs at the base of the jambs of an opening in the W wall of the tower above the tower arch seen internally, Fig. 121, 8. At Bradford-on-Avon, presently to be noticed, stepped bases to Lisenen occur, and one is seen low down in Fig. 133 on the N side of the chancel, while the internal blind arcade at Dunham Magna, Norfolk, has the form in Fig. 135. Returning to Barnack we find that the string course which intervenes between the lowest and the second stage of the tower and

again higher up is profiled in a series of square sectioned projections and recesses that resemble step-work and are given at 2 in Fig. 121. Mr Irvine called attention to the remarkable fact that this same profile occurs as a cornice at the top of the ancient walls of the crypt at Repton, a building he had minutely studied, but here, Fig. 121, 3, it is the right way up while at Barnack the moulding is reversed. This correspondence between Repton and Barnack has of course chronological significance (pp. 315, 319).

Lastly there is a case of what we shall come to know as the Saxo-Norman overlap, Chap. XIII, in the N door of the Norman nave at Stow, Lincolnshire, Fig. 199, where at the top of the E jamb which is partly constructed in l. and s. fashion there is a Norman scalloped cap, ornamented above on the vertical face with a step-pattern in relief, that is not a Norman form at all but a distinct Saxon survival. The above is somewhat of a digression but it seemed well to bring these characteristic Saxon step-patterns together and to associate them with the principal example, the remarkable impost of the Barnack tower arch.

A feature of unique interest is to be seen in the W interior wall of the tower. This is a recess apparently intended for a seat, with a triangular head starting from square imposts that surmount the jambs. It is about 3 ft. 6 in. in width, by




FIG. 121, Step-pattern mouldings of various Saxon dates.

a depth of 1 ft. 4 in. The seat is 1 ft. 8 in. from the present floor. When in 1854-5 the tower was cleared out and restored under the care of Canon Argles, some indications were found of a range of seats topped with wood that ran round the tower walls on each side of this central throne. In the N and S walls near to the tower arch (see plan Fig. 118) and 4 ft. from the ground, there are small niches, resembling aumbries, like those in the upper chamber of the tower at Deerhurst, mentioned (p. 213).

It will be remembered that the Saxon church or part of it was a recognized place for legal transactions (see vol. 1, p. 371) and we have the definite statement that the S porch of the cathedral at Canterbury was used as a court of justice. It is quite in accordance with likelihood to imagine the spacious interior of the tower at Barnack employed for a similar purpose. The presiding official has his place marked out for him in the W niche while other persons charged with the conduct of business would be accommodated on the lateral benches. The wide tower arch would enable the people generally to attend the proceedings without crowding into the space reserved for the officials.¹

The upper stages of the tower present the usual appearance of former habitation, and Mr Irvine worked out a scheme of arrangements by which the tower could have been made fit for residential purposes. From the position of the windows he argued that the principal apartment, now the ringing chamber, was divided into two with an intermediate passage,

¹ It has been argued that these aumbry-like niches at Barnack have an ecclesiastical significance, and that their presence is inconsistent with the theory of the use of the ground story of the tower for legal business. But the recesses in Deerhurst tower and in that of Skipwith, Fig. 149 (p. 332), were not necessarily connected with altars. Moreover even if the recesses at Barnack were altar-aumbries this would not preclude the use of the tower for placita. There was an altar to St Gregory in the porch-tower at Canterbury that was actually so used. See Willis, *Canterbury Cathedral*, p. 11. For Barnack see *Journal of Arch. Ass.*, 1899.

while there were other chambers above. The doorway, which here as elsewhere opens in the E wall of the tower, is at the level of nearly 35 ft. above the ground, and gave access in his view to a space between the flat roof of the nave and the external gable, the mark of which, about 12 ft. higher up, is to be seen on the E face of the tower. In connection with this question of residence it must be noted that the level of the supposed principal apartments was more than 30 ft. above the floor of the tower, and even allowing, as Mr Irvine assumed, an intermediate landing, the access by ladders throughout the tower must have been very troublesome, and the whole residence an extremely inconvenient one for persons of any distinction. On these questions see (p. 330 f.).

The tower of Earls Barton, Northamptonshire, figured on the Frontispiece, is by far the most noteworthy architectural monument of the Saxon period. It is one of the few in which we can honestly take an aesthetic as well as an antiquarian interest, for it represents an idea of some grandeur carried out with great pains and elaboration. It is a useful object lesson in the artistic capabilities and shortcomings of the Saxon builder. It has undeniable greatness not only of actual size—the tower measures 68 ft. 8 in. to the top of the modern battlements by a width on the W face of a little over 24 ft.—but also of dignity of statement. The designer has made the best of the means at his disposal, and has employed most of the details available at his time in more exuberant fashion than in any other example about the country save perhaps the other great Northamptonshire tower of Barnack. Yet the effect is not truly architectural. The mass of the structure is fine but the details do not grow naturally out of the construction, nor on the other hand are they in accordance with the grammatical employment of such details in architecture generally. Care has been taken in small points such as the finish of the upright pilaster strips under the first string course, but the base of the tower was set out so carelessly

that the S side is about a foot longer than that to N, while the SW angle is decidedly acute and the NW correspondingly obtuse, see plan Fig. 122. Being however what it is, the most characteristic piece of Saxon work in the land, it is worth while examining it in some detail.

From a simple square plinth rise the walls of rubble work plastered. They have a thickness on the ground story of about 4 ft. but they decrease in thickness by the sets-off as they ascend,




FIG. 122, Plan of western tower,
Earls Barton, Northamptonshire.

till at the belfry stage just under the battlements they measure 2 ft. 6 in. The faces are enriched by vertical and horizontal members and the corners are strongly accented. The vertical members are pilaster strips about 4 in. in width and they are joined at different heights by round or straight-sided arches arranged in a fanciful and illogical fashion. The round arches above the first string course have no sense in that position. The horizontal divisions are three

string courses of which the first has a hollow chamfer, the other two being square in section. The quoins show pronounced l. and s. work, and it may be noticed that the 'short' pieces, or as they should rather be called the flat slabs, are not, as is often the case, cut back in a line with the 'long' or upright pieces so that the plaster would up to this line conceal them. The present plastering of the tower is modern but when the original plastering was complete these pieces would always have been apparent. It should be remarked that the E quoins of the tower are as marked as the W and come right down to the ground, though the more modern nave has been built up against them. This point, it will be seen, is of

some importance, for it establishes a distinct difference between the towers of Earls Barton and of Barnack. A reference to the plan of the latter, in Fig. 118, will show that the E quoins are in bond with the W wall of the nave the Saxon quoins of which are to be seen a little to the N and S of the tower, thus showing that the Saxon nave was broader than the tower. At Earls Barton the reverse is the case, because the two E quoins of the tower come down independently to the ground, and what came E of the tower was of narrower dimensions. The significance of this will appear in connection with Barton-on-Humber, and with Broughton, Lincolnshire.

The openings on the ground story are a tower arch that has been altered in Norman and in later times, and a characteristic W door of which Fig. 123 gives a view. The height to the crown of the arch is 8 ft. 7 in., the width between the jambs 3 ft. 3 in. The head of the doorway is on the exterior cut out of two stones, but in the interior the whole head is formed in a single huge block. The jambs are formed by large slabs set upright alternating with flat ones after a fashion we have come to know. On the N side the slab which forms almost the whole height of the jamb is 4 ft. 6 in. high, 6 in. thick and 3 ft. 7 in. in depth. The enrichment consists in an outer order of upright pilaster strips square in section that are bent round above in the shape of the arch, and two inner mouldings half-round in section. The imposts and the plinths are plain square blocks, but upon the soffit and face of the former there is an incised enrichment consisting in a plain sort of arcading only cut in to a depth of about $\frac{3}{16}$ th of an inch. This arcading Mr J. T. Irvine considered to be an afterthought of a Norman carver, but it may be original.

Above this doorway is an internally splayed window of a common form that appears to be an insertion of Norman times, for it interferes with an older double window of the original work which is now blocked on the exterior, but which

resembled the double opening that still exists on the S face of the tower and is shown in the view (see Frontispiece). These




FIG. 123, West doorway, Earls Barton Tower, Northants.

openings are double splayed and the apertures on the W side were cut in mid-wall slabs in the form of a circle, while the

apertures on S are in the form of a cross with equal arms. It is worth noting that at East Lexham in Norfolk there is a mid-wall slab in a pre-Conquest opening in the tower that is also cruciform, only there the cross is stone and the background aperture, while at Earls Barton it is the aperture that is cruciform. Above each of these S openings is an enrichment of narrow roll mouldings disposed about a central cross carved in relief.

On the intermediate stage where is the clock-face occur on every side but N those enigmatical doorways apparently leading no whither, to which attention has been called in connection with Deerhurst (p. 213), and which are discussed on a later page (p. 337). The triangular-headed openings on the stage above are curious. Like the r. h. doorways, they are cut straight through the thickness of the wall without any splay. This is usual in the case of doorways but quite abnormal in that of window openings, which especially in Late Saxon work are always deeply splayed either internally or on both faces of the wall.

We now come to the uppermost stage where the original work ends. Here is the bell-chamber, and for the free transmission of the sound there is on each face a group of five openings that are arranged in a fashion that gives us an interesting modification of the usual mid-wall work. The plan of the S group of openings, Fig. 124, shows that the main part of the thickness of the wall is carried by simple square



FIG. 124, Plan of part of belfry stage,
Earls Barton.

stone pillars, while the shafts that are intended to be seen are thrust forward to the external edge of the opening, the result being an arrangement resembling in a rude form the duplicated

shafts in Early Christian buildings spoken of (p. 247). The same arrangement may be observed below in the case of the double splayed lights with cruciform apertures. Here shafts of the same kind as those in the belfry openings above are pushed out on projecting corbels and employed as mere ornaments not supporting anything. This is only another instance of the illogical treatment of features to which attention has already been called.

Barton-on-Humber is the third of these imposing and ornate towers which are here located in the early part of Period C. Over and above the interest it possesses as a tower it introduces us through its position and its adjuncts to some fresh architectural forms and arrangements. As shown in Fig. 125 it exhibits l. and s. quoins and pilaster strips which are joined by round and triangular arches in a fashion rather more logical than that illustrated at Earls Barton. On the ground story of the tower there are doorways on S and N, a tower arch opening into the body of the church, and another archway giving access on W to an adjunct of Saxon date and similar workmanship, but without the pilaster strips. In this W adjunct there are to be seen the unmistakable marks of an original W doorway. From this doorway the cut stones of the jambs and archivolt were at some time removed, and the irregular gaping void filled up with rubble of soft white chalkstone, the whole with the W wall generally having been plastered over. All this was made clear a little time ago by the investigations carried on by the Rev. W. E. Varah, vicar of Barton-on-Humber, at the conclusion of operations which have resulted in rescuing this W adjunct from a somewhat derelict condition, and seating it and the ground floor of the tower to serve for week day services, thereby effecting a notable improvement. Mr Varah has written on the church one of those excellent little monographs which we owe to scholarly and patriotic custodians of our glorious mediaeval religious monuments. Mr Varah





FIG. 125, Barton-on-Humber: the Church in its present condition. All E of the tower is later.

(To face p. 288.)



thinks that the W adjunct was much earlier than the tower, but the double splayed windows and the l. and s. quoins should bring it into Period C.

The windows in the adjunct consist in a r. h. double splayed light on each lateral face,¹ in which is to be noted the peculiarity that the aperture is not in the middle of the thickness of the wall but nearer its outer face. This occurs also in some apparently very late churches in Sussex, but it is evident from the instance here at Barton that it is not necessarily a mark of lateness. There are also two circular double splayed openings one above the other in the W wall as seen in Fig. 124 suggesting that there was an internal flooring between the two levels (p. 341). In both of these last openings there still remain portions of the original wooden mid-wall slab, pierced with a number of holes three-quarters of an inch in diameter for the transmission of light.

The tower shows on its first story on each lateral face a r. h. double window, with mid-wall shaft that is here of a distinct baluster form as shown in Fig. 107, A (p. 262). Higher up on each of the four faces is another such window with a triangular head. The uppermost story contains double belfry openings divided by mid-wall shafts that have no baluster-like form, with curious capitals of which no. xi in Fig. 192 (p. 413) gives a specimen, and through-stones exactly of the type we shall become familiar with in the late towers of the 'Lincolnshire' group. This stage is later in date than the rest of the tower, but like the other parts just described is of Saxon workmanship. The handsome and very spacious aisled nave and chancel are of the later mediaeval periods.

The point of chief interest for our purpose is the evidence that the building affords of a type of early church of a somewhat singular kind, in which the ground story of a square tower forms the nave or body of the oratory, a small chancel

¹ Mr Varah writes that the removal of plastering has shown that these windows were originally circular like those in the W wall.

being built on to the east of it. In the year 1898 some investigations kindly made by Mr Hodgson Fowler, in the course of extensive works he was in charge of at Barton-on-Humber church, brought to light direct evidence that in its earliest condition, or at any rate in Saxon days, the tower with its W adjunct was the church, and nothing appeared





FIG. 126, Western wall of nave, Barton-on-Humber Church, showing marks of original chancel walls of Saxon date.

E of this save a small square ended presbytery some fifteen feet in internal length. The proof of this is worth giving. The E wall of the tower, forming the W wall of the existing nave, was stripped of its plastering in 1897 and disclosed the distinct marks of side-walls projecting from it to E, Fig. 126. That these were the walls of the original chancel was proved by excavation which laid bare the SE quoin and enough of the foundations to show its size and shape. The result is the ground-plan given in Fig. 127, while Fig. 128 when compared with Fig. 125 exhibits the contrast between

the aspect of the original Saxon church of which the ground story of the tower was the nave, and the later mediaeval structure in which the original small chancel has developed into a relatively enormous edifice. The uppermost story of the Saxon tower has been replaced in Fig. 128 by a saddle-back roof, for which there seems some evidence at Corbridge, and the gables are finished with stone crosses after the fashion of one preserved in Corbridge church, and shown in Fig. 129.

This is a striking object lesson in the growth of the






FIG. 128, Barton-on-Humber, original form of the Saxon Church.

mediaeval church. Such growth in nearly every case resulted in a great proportionate extension of the eastern part. It is rare to find a Saxon chancel complete, that portion of the church having in most cases been amplified in later times.




FIG. 127, Plan of original Saxon church at Barton-on-Humber.

At Bosham, Sussex, there are distinct marks of two extensions, in the Early Norman and in the Early English styles. This is only in accordance with the tendency which in more advanced mediaeval days so modified the interiors of some of our greater churches that the E part became a complete church of cruciform plan, the nave passing out of importance. This is what took place at Canterbury, Lincoln, and elsewhere. Here at Barton-on-Humber it was not that the chancel was enlarged, but a whole new church, nave and aisles and chancel together, was substituted for it, the tower and W adjunct being for a long time relegated to the condition of lumber sheds.

Not far away, at Broughton near Brigg in Lincolnshire, another example of this same type of church can be detected. We have here an illustration of the difficulties in the matter of arrangement in this part of the subject referred to at the




FIG. 129, Saxon gable cross from Corbridge Church.

outset (p. 4). The Broughton monument groups itself naturally with Barton-on-Humber as another certain extant example of a very peculiar type of church plan, but in point of time it is widely sundered from it, for there can be very little doubt that Broughton, though Saxon in scheme, was




FIG. 130, Tower, formerly chancel, arch at
Broughton, W face.

really built after the Conquest (p. 417). Hence from the chronological point of view consideration of it should be deferred, but from that of morphology its connection with Barton must be maintained. The church of this village, noteworthy as one of the only two which even touch the straight Roman road from Lincoln to the Humber in its

course of thirty miles, has a square W tower with a later semi-circular stair turret on its W face. The present tower arch is ornate on the side towards the tower but very plain towards the church, and is clearly the original chancel arch of a church of the form now fixed at the neighbouring Barton-on-Humber.




FIG. 131, The same, E face.

Some indications of a small chancel were found here several years ago in connection with works for the heating apparatus.¹ It needs however only a glance at the drawings of the two faces of the tower arch, Figs. 130 and 131, to see that the W face was the one intended to be seen. The same is the case with the tower arch at Barton-on-Humber, where the

¹ See *Archaeological Journal*, LIII, 335.

W face is decoratively treated with projecting imposts, pilaster strips, and a corresponding hood mould, while a smooth slab above this last is carved at the top 'en creux' with a human head in relief and was probably completed with a painted representation of the Crucified. The E face of the same arch is quite plain, see Fig. 154. It may be noticed that the enrichment of the E face of the archway between the tower and the W adjunct, while its W face is plain, is some evidence that the W adjunct is, like the chancel, an appendage to the tower and not, as it has been held to be, prior to it.

The Broughton arch has the curious peculiarity that the angle shaft on the N side in its lower part has been almost worn away, apparently by the process of using it as a whetstone for the sharpening of tools or implements. Such marks, generally in the form of narrow cuts or grooves, are often enough seen on the quoin stones or on the porches of our ancient churches. There are many on the porch at Goodmanham, Yorkshire. They have sometimes been explained as the marks made by sharpening arrow-heads in the good old days of the long-bow, when the butts were set up near the church, and the graveyard was used as a place of muster if not of actual exercise (see vol. 1, p. 364). In most cases however, as here at Broughton, the author of the mysterious indications is more likely to have been some gravedigger or gardener of the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries.

We have thus at Barton and Broughton two certain instances of a type of church in which the tower formed what we should call the nave or main division of the interior. It is a type for which a parallel may be found in Germany at Werden a. d. Ruhr, where, according to Effmann's demonstration, a structure of the kind was reared about the year 900,¹ and is described as consisting in a square central tower, about 30 ft. on a side in interior measurement, with aisles

¹ *Die Karol. Otton. Bauten zu Werden*, p. 168.

W, N, and S, the E side being joined on to an earlier church. It would be interesting to know whether among our Anglo-Saxon buildings there are other examples that can be included in the same category. The difference between a tower thus treated and an ordinary W tower will be seen in the E quoins. When the tower forms the body of the church the chancel which is joined to it will be narrower than the tower, and this will accordingly have its E quoins complete to the ground as they show equally with those at W. The normal W tower, as in the case of all those of the 'Lincolnshire' type, is narrower than the nave to which it is joined. The E wall of the tower is part of the W wall of the church and this projects for one or two feet on each side showing its own quoins. Hence the appearance of nave quoins on each side of a tower removes it out of the category now under discussion, while on the other hand when the E tower quoins come down to the ground there is a possibility that it once had a small chancel to E of it. Earls Barton answers to this description, whereas we have seen that Barnack, the aspect of which would suggest a tower church, exhibits traces of the quoins of an old nave to N and S, and must have been all along a W tower. We shall probably therefore be right, as Mr Mickethwaite suggested, in regarding Earls Barton as a 'tower church' though the opening from tower to nave has been altered and affords no evidence.

Apart from Earls Barton, Mr Hamilton Thompson¹ has suggested that the interesting Saxon tower of Hough-on-the-Hill, not far from Grantham, may have formed the body of a church. It possesses ample floor space and a S door like Broughton, while like Broughton it has a W stair turret giving access to its upper levels. The present church is later, and there is no evidence of the Saxon arrangements E of the tower.

¹ *The Ground Plan of the English Parish Church*, Cambridge University Press, 1913, p. 32.

Of those outstanding monuments, which alike on general and on special grounds have been here ascribed to the period of monastic revival of the last part of X, one still remains for notice, and this is the well known Saxon church at Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts, of which the plan and section are given in Fig. 132.

The feature of chief interest here is the lateral porch or chapel (for the two functions might be combined) that we




FIG. 132, Plan, and section of nave, of the Saxon church at Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts.

have already met with at St Pancras (p. 84) and Christ Church, Canterbury (p. 77). Not many Saxon lateral porches actually survive, but more modern porches have been here and there constructed in front of original Saxon doors, as at Breamore, Hants ; Daglingworth, Gloucestershire, etc. The example at Bishopstone (p. 193) is fine original Saxon work, and may be comparatively early. It will be remembered that the door into the church is not in the centre of the porch but on the W side, so as to leave the E part of the

porch interior free. A similar arrangement meets us here at Bradford-on-Avon.

This remarkable little building is of the nave and square-ended chancel type but has also special interest on account of its lateral porches. A few general words upon it may fittingly precede an analysis of its form and features.

William of Malmesbury in his life of Aldhelm states that the West-Saxon bishop was generally supposed to have built a monastery at Bradford,¹ and adds, 'to this day at that place there exists a little church which he is said to have made in honour of the most blessed St Laurence.'² Writing in 1858 the Rev. Canon Jones, then vicar of Bradford-on-Avon, stated that the site of Aldhelm's monastery 'was most probably near the north east end of the present (parish) church, a spot of ground there still bearing the name of the Abbey yard.'³ On the site thus indicated there existed a confused complexus of buildings of various dates, and from the midst of these the perspicacity and zeal of Canon Jones succeeded in extricating the highly interesting little Saxon chapel which in its restored condition Fig. 133 presents to the reader.

When the building was taken in hand for restoration the chancel was divided into two stories and used as a cottage the chimney of which went up where the chancel arch had formerly been. The nave, also with an intermediate floor, was a school, and the schoolmaster's residence was in a house built up against it on S. A woollen manufactory abutted upon it on N and the W part had been modernized, so that everybody supposed it of the eighteenth century. About 1870 it was cleared and restored, but as needs hardly to be said the masonry has been so knocked about, patched, and

¹ Necnon et apud Bradeford tertium ab eo monasterium instructum crebra serit opinio. (The other two were at Malmesbury and Frome, Somerset.)

² Et est ad hunc diem eo loco ecclesiola quam ad nomen beatissimi Laurentii fecisse predicatur. *Gesta Pontificum*, Rolls Series, no. 52, p. 346.

³ *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, v, 12.

renewed, that it is only in parts that we find any large surface of original work. This when it can be examined shows masonry of largish stones, running to some 2 ft. in height and width by 1 ft. in thickness, of the excellent local material the use of which gives the whole town of Bradford so handsome an appearance.¹ The stones are well cut though not accurately squared and a large number of the joints are not vertical or horizontal but sloping. The actual jointing of the stones is however remarkably fine, and excited the admiration of an expert in masonry, the late J. T. Irvine, who left among his papers a valuable set of drawings and notes about the church, made during the restoration from 1869 to 1874.

The walls, which have a mean thickness of 2 ft. 5 in. exclusive of plinths and pilasters, rise from a plain square plinth now owing to the accumulation of the soil only visible on S and E. The quoins exhibit no special treatment, except what they receive in connection with the general scheme of external enrichment which is one of the peculiarities of the structure. This consists in a series of pilasters in the lower story of the elevation and arcading above, the two being separated by the projection of a horizontal string course. The pilasters embrace the angles, and the various wall spaces are divided below by intermediate pilasters, some of which rise with a step-like base from a shallow plinth distinct from the lower projecting plinth just mentioned. The short pilasters of the arcading above have trapezoidal bases occasionally stepped, and plain trapezoidal caps. On the E face of the chancel and in the E gable of the nave and N gable of the porch they are reeded. The scheme of decoration seems to have been carried out by cutting into the face of the finished wall to a shallow depth, the jointing of the stones being in parts of the work entirely ignored, so that at first sight the

¹ There is a notice of Bradford-on-Avon in Freeman's *English Towns and Districts*, Lond., 1883.





FIG. 133, Saxon Church at Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts, from NE.

(To face p. 298.)



effect is that of incised enrichment rather than of architectural ornament proper, which is more closely connected with construction.

To say this however does not imply that the decoration is out of all relation to the fabric, or that, as Sir John Henry Parker suggested, it might have been added at a later period to an already existing unadorned structure. A careful examination of the work, especially in regard to the planes of its various surfaces, shows that the enrichment was planned when the stones of the walling were laid, and is necessarily contemporary with the fabric. Fig. 134 shows a portion of it on the N side of the chancel drawn to scale,¹ with indications of the relations as regards projection of the different faces. The string course, shown in the general view (Fig. 133) as dividing the wall horizontally at about two-thirds of its height, is formed all along in a single course of stones 6½ in. high, and always projected about 1 in. from the main face of the wall. The trapezoidal bases of the pilasters of the arcade above the string course, with the parts between them, are also formed in a single course of stones, and the same is the case with the capitals above the pilasters and the parts between them. The height of these courses is much less than the average height of the wall stones generally, and whereas the wall stones vary in size in the most irregular manner, these particular courses run practically without a break all round the building.

Furthermore, the face of the trapezoidal caps is in projection over the original main face of the wall, just as is the face of the string course below, and before the arcading was incised this course wherein the caps are cut must have stood out like the string course, though with somewhat less projection. Whether this was also the case with the course in

¹ Some of the smaller features in the drawing have been taken from other parts of the building, in order that a conspectus of the peculiarities of the work may be presented.

which the bases are cut is in the present condition of the work not easy to decide. The pilasters lastly, though generally cut out of wider stones, are in some cases, as on the E face of the chancel, in stones of just the width required, while in almost every case the height of them, about 2 ft., is in a single stone, thus showing that the pilasters, like the caps and bases,




FIG. 134. Pilasters, arcading, etc., on the exterior of Bradford-on-Avon, with section of chancel wall. Scale $\frac{1}{32}$ of nature. The original wall face is represented by the face of the upper and lower pilasters and the part above the arcading.

were prepared for in the structure of the wall. These observations, which can be made on the building in its existing condition, are borne out by the results of an examination of the actual fabric of the E wall of the chancel made during the restorations, and embodied in one of Mr Irvine's invaluable drawings reproduced at the sinister side of Fig. 134.

It is clear therefore that the enrichment, though of the incised kind, is in close connection with the structure with which it must necessarily be coeval. The fact thus established

has a bearing on the debated question of the date of the building. A theory of the probable date of the decorative arcading, and hence of the whole structure, may be gained by comparing it with a feature bearing a remarkable resemblance to it in a church in a distant county. The reference is to a scheme of shallow arcading which occurs round the interior of the nave of the Saxon church of Dunham Magna, Norfolk, Fig. 135. The scale is rather larger than at Bradford.

This is undoubtedly very late and perhaps in point of time actually post-Conquest, for as will be seen in Fig. 135, the imposts of the blind arches have a quirk above and below and are ornamented on the face with Norman-like sunk stars and chevrons while the stepped bases are on the other hand Saxon. The span of the arches is 3 ft. 11 in. and the pilasters are 13 in. wide. The relief is about 3 in.




FIG. 135, Arcading in the interior of the nave of Dunham Magna, Norfolk.

No doubt external arcading is a much earlier feature than internal, and the former occurs in Early Christian work at Ravenna, on the tomb chapel of Galla Placidia and S. Apollinare in Classe, and in Carolingian or Early Romanesque at Lorsch, and at Gernrode (pp. 241, 242). The Bradford arcading, Rivoira insists, is in itself a late feature and if so it would be against the date of about 973 that Irvine assigned to the Bradford chapel. There is so much about it on the other hand that suggests a period of vigorous work and originality that it may be placed early in Period C, and not near the Norman Conquest. Rivoira would, even, make it post-Conquest, on the strength of what he calls the 'Lombardo-Norman' feature of the

arcading,¹ and he makes light of the difficulty, which to most people will be a very serious one, that W. of Malmesbury, a west-countryman, writing only half a century after its assumed date of erection, thinks it was built about the year 700. William, with his local knowledge and interest in architecture, would hardly have made this mistake about a post-Conquest structure, though it would have been quite possible if the building had come down as a monument of Saxon antiquity.

We may now enter the little church through the doorway into the N porch. This is extremely narrow, and the jambs slope considerably, being 2 ft. 1 in. apart under the imposts but about 2 ft. 4 in. below, and it is much to W of the middle of the wall. The reason for this doubtless is that an altar, or conceivably a font, was originally placed against the E wall within the porch, which was in this way turned into a lateral chapel, and the same surmise may be made about the porch at Bishopstone. It had been a subject for discussion whether or not there was a corresponding porch or chapel on the S side, but conclusive evidence that this was the case came to light in the course of the restoration, and now that the S side of the nave has been set free and cleaned, the mark of the old porch is plainly to be seen upon it, and is quite distinct from the marks of the house that till recently was built up against this side of the little structure. If we replace on the plan this second porch we shall find that the two porches measured together offer an interior space equal to nearly two-thirds the area of the nave. Lateral porches of this size, especially when used also as chapels, become something like transepts, and as we shall see later on have an importance in connection with the general development of ground plans.

On entering the body of the church we are struck all at once by the great proportionate height of the side walls, of which Saxon peculiarity Bradford presents an extreme example. There is a plain plinth all round the walls of about 2 in. pro-

¹ l.c., II, 175.

jection. Leaving this out of account, the nave measures nearly 25 ft. in length by 13 ft. 8 in. in width, but the height to the top of the walls is more than 25 ft., so that the interior is as high as it is long and nearly twice as high as it is wide. The section appended to the plan, Fig. 132, shows this peculiarity. In connection with this it is important to know that there is no trace that the church or any part of it ever had two floors. This suggestion, which had been made, was decisively negatived by the results of the technical examination of the structure when under restoration. The chancel, measuring 13 ft. 4 in. in length by a mean of 10 ft. 2 in. in width, is entered from the nave through an archway 3 ft. 6 in. wide, that is for the most part a restoration. It is the narrowest chancel arch in any church under notice, and can in this respect only be paralleled in certain oratories of primitive type though of uncertain date in Orkney and Caithness.¹

It is worth suggesting that the narrow doorway may be a local peculiarity. It occurs at Somerford Keynes, not so far away (p. 190), but the most striking instance is close at hand, at Limpley Stoke, where has survived a remarkable S doorway 8 ft. 9 in. high and only 2 ft. 5 in. wide (p. 466).

Jambs and archivolt both in the chancel arch and the doorways exhibit the characteristic strip-work already illustrated. The treatment of the archivolt of the chancel arch reminds us of the classical ionic architrave with its three fasciae. The reeded pilaster of the N door may be compared with the pilasters similarly treated on the exterior. All the imposts are square and unadorned. There are three windows preserving more or less their primitive form but only that in the chancel is really original. That in the S wall of the nave is a

¹ Some of the pre-Norman Scottish churches, old in type if not always in actual date, have very narrow chancel arches (Anderson, *Scotland in Early Christian Times*, 1, 60 f.) and so had an early oratory now almost buried in the sand near Gwithian in Cornwall. On the other hand, many of the early nave and chancel churches in Ireland have wide arches. See Fig. 23.

restoration and the porch window has been altered. These windows are all splayed outside and in, and the original window in the chancel has sloping jambs.

Very notable is the occurrence high up in the E wall of the nave above the chancel arch of two figures of angels sculptured in low relief. They are hovering horizontally in the air each holding over the two arms a napkin. They are among the most important or at any rate the best preserved examples of Saxon figure sculpture in its connection with architecture, and form no doubt a portion of a lost group, or Rood, a figure of the Crucified originally forming the centre. It is well to mention that Canon Jones stated that they were 'found embedded in the wall' above the chancel arch one on each side, and when he wrote in 1858 they were then 'placed over a wooden porch which has been erected as an entrance to the building on the west side.'¹ The reliefs are accordingly not now in situ but were placed where they are at the restoration of the building, and are obviously at far too great an elevation.


The best preserved of the two reliefs is given in Fig. 136 and the work merits some attention. The figure, to which another in the reversed position almost exactly corresponds, measures in length about 3 ft. 6 in. and its position and aspect suggest that it once occupied the space on the sinister side of the head of a cross above the sinister arm with which it would agree approximately in length. Figures or portions of figures of angels occur quite commonly in this position above the transom of a cross, though sometimes, as in the Crucifixion on the Ruthwell Cross, their place is taken by the sun and moon. Such figures are of early even antique origin, and are derived from effigies representing funereal genii who in pairs hold medallions with portraits of the deceased on Roman sarcophagi or tombstones. On objects of Christian use, as on the carved ivory cover of the Gospels

¹ *Wiltshire Magazine*, loc. cit., p. 449.



FIG. 136, Carved angel from Bradford-on-Avon.

(To face p. 394.)



of Etschmiadzin published by Strzygowski,¹ horizontal figures of the kind appear as angels, and all through Early Christian and Early Mediaeval times they are to be found on ivories and in small sculpture of continental provenance as well as in MSS. The veiling of the hands in a portion of the garment or in a cloth is derived from the ceremonial of the later imperial court, where it became etiquette so to cover the hands when receiving something adorable, even a letter from the emperor ;² or when about to hand over some precious object to a potentate, as is the case with martyrs' crowns in S. Apollinare Nuovo and the Orthodox Baptistery at Ravenna. Angels are shown in the works referred to above with hands so veiled even when there is nothing visible to give or to receive, and these furnish a precedent for the same detail at Bradford, which is to be regarded as inspired by Eastern-Christian ivories or MSS. Though this be the source from which the position of the angels and their veiled hands have been derived, there may be noted resemblances in the drapery to that of figures in the MSS. of the so-called 'Winchester school' recently treated by Mr H. P. Mitchell in the *Burlington Magazine* for 1923. It does not follow that the Bradford sculptor copied the English MSS. for the works may all represent a common tradition, but the fluttering scarf, originally it would seem a pallium, of the MSS. figures appears above the angel's shoulders, and the band of drapery round the waist is a feature specially prominent in these same Saxon MSS. figures. Hence the Bradford angels have a certain chronological significance and would be quite at home at the end of X or early part of XI, though figures of the kind occur on the Continent in XII, as in the mosaics of the Martorana at Palermo built in 1143.

¹ *Byzantinische Denkmäler*, Tom. 1, Pl. 1.


² Cabrol, *Dictionnaire*, art. 'Adoration,' vol. 1, p. 545.

CHAPTER XI

SOME DATABLE THIRD PERIOD CHURCHES

THE TIMBER church at Greenstead, Essex, we have seen good reason to date about the year 1015 (p. 39). This would be the time of Cnut who is credited with considerable activity in the building and restoration of churches.¹ There has been suggested a similar date for the remarkable Essex church of Hadstock, owing to its assumed connection with the turning point in that chieftain's career. As a memorial of the decisive victory he obtained in 1016 over Edmund Ironside Cnut is said to have built a church in the locality of the battle known as that of Ashington. Now there is an 'Ashington' near Rochford in the S part of the county and an 'Ashton' in the NW corner near Saffron Walden, and as Hadstock is the next parish to Ashton it has been sought to identify the church at the former place with Cnut's memorial minster. Ashton however lies in a tangled country of hills and valleys quite unsuitable for military operations on any scale, while between Rochford and the estuary of the Crouch N of it, in the vicinity of Ashington, there is a line of low hills, quite as conspicuous a natural feature as the Vimy Ridge, that answers to the 'mons' of which we read in the account of the fight, with, at its foot, the 'aequus locus' or level ground where the forces actually encountered. And not only topography but history favour conclusively the S site. Florence of Worcester, who, with the author of the *Encomium Emmae*, gives a fuller account than the A.S. chronicler, tells

¹ W. of Malmes., *Gesta Regum*, ad ann. 1017.






FIG. 137, View of Deerhurst Chapel, with the house in which it was incorporated.

us that after Edmund's victory at Otford in Kent the Danes retired to Sheppey, and on Edmund's withdrawal Cnut 'suas copias in Eastsaxoniam trajecit,' obviously by his fleet. Thence they raided Mercia and with the booty 'ad naves repedant festini.' Edmund comes up with them 'in monte qui Assandun . . . nominatur,' and a battle follows in the 'aequus locus' to which Cnut withdrew his troops, the Danes remaining masters of the hard-fought field. They then, according to the *Encomiast*, betake themselves to London, again obviously in their ships, that must have remained in one of the Essex havens, probably in the estuary of the Crouch which runs N of Ashington. It was therefore near the Thames and not to the NW corner of the county that Cnut in 1020 'ferde to Assandune & let timbrian ðar an mynster of stane & lime far ðare manna sawle ðe ðar ofslagene wæran' (*Chron.*, 1020 F.).

Hadstock, the monumental interest of which still remains to be signaled (p. 365) cannot accordingly be connected with these operations on the part of Cnut, and there is really nothing after Greenstead that can be definitely dated in his active reign. There are three later Anglo-Saxon monuments one of which can be fairly fixed on documentary evidence, while for the two others we have the distinct evidence of inscriptions. The first example is the central part of Stow, Lincolnshire, that we shall see reason to place about 1040. As the chief interest of this is connected with the development of the cruciform plan a notice of it is reserved till these plans are under consideration (p. 348 f.). The other two are Deerhurst Chapel and Kirkdale. Deerhurst shares with Heysham (p. 187 f.) the honour of being one of the two places in rural England that still possess a pre-Conquest chapel in the same village as a partly Saxon church. In the year 1675 there was discovered at Deerhurst an inscribed stone, now preserved in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, that records the dedication by Earl Odda of what he calls a

'royal hall,' by which we may understand a 'basilica' or church, at a date in Edward the Confessor's reign that corresponds with April 12, 1056.¹ This was formerly supposed to refer to the priory church of St Mary, now the parish church, which we have seen to be a Saxon building of exceptional value but in 1885 the discovery was made of a small Saxon chapel incorporated in the fabric of an old mansion, now a farm-house, and it is recognized that the inscription, which was actually found close to this house, refers to the chapel, the date and character of which are accordingly fixed. The building is still attached at its E end to the farm-house as shown in Fig. 137. It has double splayed lights in the N and S walls of the nave, which measures about 25 ft. by 16 ft. The chancel arch springs from an impost the profile of which, Fig. 191 E, is notable for the sharp nicks between the timidly treated mouldings. The external view Fig. 137 shows l. and s. work on the SW quoin.

The other example, Kirkdale near Kirkby Moorside in Yorkshire, possesses the remarkable inscribed sundial that was published in Vol. 1 at p. 357. This fixes the building of the existing church at about the year 1060. There is now a W tower but this is a modern addition, and a drawing of 1821 published by C. L. R. Tudor, *Kirkdale Church*, Lond., 1876, shows it as a simple nave-and-chancel structure ending with a W gabled wall on the ground level of which is a W doorway, now leading from the tower to the church but originally external. The jamb and the springing of the arch of this doorway are given in Fig. 184 B. The drawing of 1821 showed a horizontal string-course crossing the W front

¹ The inscription runs as follows (see *Archaeologia*, 1, 70):—Odda Dux jussit hanc regiam aulam construi atque dedicari in honore S Trinitatis pro anima germani sui Ælfrici que de hoc loco asūpta. Ealdredus vero Ep̄s qui eandem dedicavit 11 Idibus Apl. xiiii autem annos regni Eadwardi Regis Anglorū. The fabric would be properly described as a votive or memorial oratory. Its size and relation to the main church of the place are suitably expressed by the term 'chapel.'





FIG. 138, Boarhunt, Hants, from south-east.

(To face p. 308.)



and above it a vertical pilaster strip running up to the point of the gable.

A vertical pilaster strip in the same position is in evidence at the E end of the very complete small nave-and-chancel church of Boarhunt in Hampshire of which there is given a general view in Fig. 138 and a plan in Fig. 139. In virtue of this detail the two churches may be reckoned as more or less contemporary, and what we find at Boarhunt may be regarded as of the latest Anglo-Saxon period. The following are details to be noted. Neither the proportions of the plan nor the elevation of the walls are specially Saxon and the




FIG. 139, Plan of Boarhunt Church, Hants.

quoins are of well fitted ashlar the stones set alternately N and S and E and W. There is no l. and s. work or specially big stones. Apart from the already mentioned pilaster strip, the most important feature as attesting a Saxon origin is the double splayed N window of the chancel. Here the aperture is cut in a mid-wall slab set in the centre of the thickness of the masonry, and as will be seen in Fig. 140 this has round it just where it is set in the wall a carved moulding of the cable pattern, that is commonly used in this country in work that is of Roman or Saxon or Norman and apparently also of comparatively modern¹ date. Interesting peculiarities are the marks of staples on the jamb

¹ Cable moulding occurs on the imposts of the chancel arch in Heysham parish church, where it is most probably seventeenth century work.

where hung in old times the shutter which was the only means of closing up the aperture. There is a rebate round the opening into which this shutter fitted, and this becomes a splay above, to admit of the easy action of the shutter. Another feature of interest is the chancel arch, but the character this shows is better

represented in other examples. The old N and S doors are blocked.

An important feature of the plan is the former existence of a cross-wall cutting off a portion of the W end of the nave measuring about 14 ft. from E to W. A similar feature occurs or rather occurred, for all visible traces have now been destroyed, at Daglingworth, Gloster, an assured Saxon example in which




FIG. 140, Window in chancel at Boarhunt Church, Hants. From a drawing by J. T. Irvine.

l. and s. quoins (largely renewed) are much in evidence. This same cutting off of a W section from the nave is found in two examples that have been claimed as Saxon but are here classified as Norman. One is Hooton Pagnell near Doncaster, the other the ruined building known commonly as 'The Old Minster' at or near S Elmham, Suffolk. The first named example is certainly late, the other is regarded by many good authorities as Early Saxon of VII, though the structure which is of flint rubble exhibits little, save its size and some peculiarities of plan, to mark it off from Norman apsidal chapels of the same region, such as that of Mells near Blythborough, or the chapel outside the keep at Castle Rising. As the plan, Fig. 141, shows, its




FIG. 141. Plan of the 'Old Minster' at S Elmham, Suffolk.

length is over 100 ft. and in material, technique, and form of window openings it accords with a Norman origin. The chancel arch if of a single span was of the abnormal width of more than 21 ft., and this certainly lends colour to the suggestion that we have to deal here not with a single arch but an arcade similar to that at St Pancras, Canterbury, and other examples similar (pp. 82 f., 109, 472).¹ The present writer maintains his conviction that it is Norman, and on this hypothesis its W chamber comes into line with the other examples just mentioned. This feature cannot however be discussed without reference to the question whether or not these W divisions were the ground stories of towers, and this is a matter for subsequent consideration (p. 342).

In continuance of this chronological research we may now notice a building of considerable importance certain features of which have been held to imply an advanced date in the Saxon period impinging as some would think on the Norman domain, while other parts may carry us back to X or beyond. The reference is to Repton, where a Saxon church of tolerably advanced plan has beneath its square ended chancel a crypt the vaulting of which, supported on columns, shows incipient traces of the intersecting or groined vault which otherwise is alien to Anglo-Saxon practice.

To Repton a considerable amount of archaeological study based largely on new excavations has been devoted recently by Mr Henry Vassall now Bursar of the famous school, to whom Mr C. B. Sherwin has given valuable architectural aid. To both the writer desires to express thanks for generous assistance. The older plan given in Mr Hipkins's well known little book on Repton has been now superseded in the important matter of the extension N and S of the side chapels or transepts, which the older plan made too small, and the writer has kindly been allowed the use of plans of

¹ J. T. Micklethwaite in *Arch. Journ.*, LIII, p. 318, and C. R. Peers, *ibid.*, LVIII, p. 423 f., both ascribe the building to an Early Saxon date.

the new survey a full publication of which will it is hoped before long appear. The plan so far as it concerns the present purpose is reproduced on the standard scale in Fig. 142, and Fig. 143 is that of the crypt underneath the chancel. The arrangement here is easy to understand. A, A, are the two entrances from the church on W ; D is a lamp niche but




FIG. 142, Plan of Saxon part of Repton Priory Church.

possibly once a hagnoscope, while C, C, C, are openings in the N, E, and S walls leading to chambers, probably sepulchral, that have never been fully explored.

The main plan, Fig. 142, shows a lofty square ended chancel, attested as Saxon by pilaster strips on the exterior, that opens by its full width on to a wider nave the E portion of which forming a square was cut off from the W part and, as at Deerhurst (p. 216), may have been surmounted by a

tower (p. 348). The piers of an archway cutting off this square on the W, again as at Deerhurst, have left traces under the present pavement. How far Saxon work extended to W of this square division it is at present impossible




FIG. 143, Plan of crypt at Repton, Derbyshire.

to say and there is now a handsome late mediaeval nave and aisles with a W tower and spire and a S porch.¹ To N and S of the square division there open transeptal chapels. In the older plan these were laid down as comparatively circumscribed both to N and S and to W, but excavations carried out by Mr Vassall have shown that the lower courses of the

Saxon walling can be followed from the chancel round the NE quoin of the nave and along the present E wall of the N transept to its full extent northwards, returning westwards for more than two-thirds the length of the N transept N wall to a point marked in the plan by a break in the walling. This gives a Saxon transept or transeptal chapel of considerable depth. Its extent westwards is somewhat problematical, but in Mr Sherwin's provisional plan it is brought as far as the W arch in the nave that marks the square division, and there is evidence for this in the existence in the W wall of the S transept (not shown in the plan) of a patch of Saxon walling on this line. The S transept generally has to be assumed as corresponding to that on N. How the transeptal chapels opened on to the central space can be judged from an old water colour drawing published by Mr Hipkins which shows an arcade of two openings. To this drawing, which may give the original arrangement, the plan is accommodated, but all that is monumentally attested are the E responds,

¹ Two older published papers on Repton by J. T. Irvine are of great value, one in the *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal*, vol. v, about the crypt, and the other with an elaborate plan of the whole church, in *Ass.* 1894.

for the lowest parts of these actually remain with the columns on the soffits of them clearly marked, and the actual columns, that once stood there are now preserved in the S porch of the church. This arrangement, with the ample transeptal spaces opening in this timid fashion to the central square or crossing, reminding us as it does of Deerhurst looks early and tentative, and as we shall see when plans of the kind come up for discussion (p. 348 f.) seems only a half-way house towards a logical cruciform plan. The capital on the column which will be found figured subsequently in Fig. 174 is however exactly the same as the capitals on the columns that sustain the vault of the crypt, Fig. 144, A, and this suggests that the crypt, or at any rate its vault, and the transept must be contemporary.

Leaving now the plan and taking the building in elevation from the floor of the crypt upwards we find emerging some very significant facts. (1) The lower part of the internal walls of the crypt is constructed of finely dressed ashlar, with nicely fitted stones some 12 in. to 18




FIG. 144, A, Capital in Repton crypt, B, upper finish of pilaster strips at Repton.

in. high, and in one case as much as 5 ft. long. The masonry above is not quite so good but the wall is crowned above at a height of about 6 ft. by a remarkable cornice of a step pattern that as Mr Irvine pointed out corresponds exactly in profile with the cornices which crown the two main stages of the tower at Barnack. The only difference is that the cornices are reversed, the greatest projection coming above at Repton but below at Barnack. The two are given in profile in Fig. 121, 2, 3. It will be

remembered that reasons have been given for dating Barnack in X.

In the present condition of the structure it is not possible to say for certain whether this cornice was returned into the openings C, C, C, leading to the sepulchral chambers,¹ but it is carried round the W recess under the (?) hagioscope D. The existing vault of the crypt is obviously of later date. The arches that divide the nine bays start from enriched piers which stand against the ashlar wall just described, and are thrown across to four columns which stand in the middle of the crypt and are connected by similar arches, Fig. 144, A. The columns have curious twisted shafts, and columns and piers alike are crowned by the above mentioned capitals the form of which has been noticed above (p. 255). The vaulting is of a very primitive kind and betrays quite unaccustomed hands. It is mostly segmental, but in some of the bays there is an approach to the intersecting vault, that seems however to have formed itself accidentally, and without any systematic planning on the part of the master mason. The central bay is the one where an intersecting vault would naturally be looked for, but there is no attempt here at groining and the square space is covered with a plain segmental vault running N and S. The only fair specimen of a groined vault is in the SE bay and there seems intention here, while in the NE and middle E bays and that in the middle on S the work is of a hap-hazard kind. To ascribe work of the kind to Norman hands or to workmen who had received any Norman training seems quite futile. An Early Norman intersecting vault like that in the undercroft of the dormitory at Westminster is a different thing entirely. It should be remarked that in the case of a tentative Saxon approach to groined vaulting there is not the least need to refer to the Normans. Intersecting vaults in the Rhineland are in full evidence and might have furnished prototypes, but as is said above the Repton groins

¹ Irvine in his Derbyshire paper says it *did* go into the recesses.

seem rather to have come of themselves than to be modelled on definite examples elsewhere.¹

Transferring attention now to the exterior we note that there is evidence in the present chancel walls that the chambers C, C, C, were covered with gabled roofs abutting on those walls, and on S there are to be seen, Fig. 142, about a couple of feet above the ground the marks of narrow slits about 2 ft. high that are the external apertures which, widely splayed on the interior, once gave light to the lower part of the building. The top of the internal splay was some 15 ft. above the floor of the crypt and comes now above the present floor of the chancel. These lights are among the hardest of the little nuts which the elucidator of Repton will have to crack. At a height of about 11 ft. above the ground there runs round the Saxon walling, from the SE wall of the nave round the chancel and NE quoin of the nave and on to the N wall of the N transept (cut away here but visible), a horizontal string course chamfered above. Above this but not below it come the pilaster strips already noticed, very evenly spaced and terminated above by little imposts which carry largish stones cut into the form of the springers of arches, Fig. 144, B. These suggest a wall arcade such as we shall find presently at Wing, and which may have occurred at Deerhurst, but it is not easy to see how such an arcade can have been worked here with the uprights spaced as they are, and as the said imposts are about 28 ft. above the ground and close under the present roof the original walls if they gave room for the arches must have been very high indeed. Probably the stones above the imposts were simply used as ornamental finish to the strips and are only reminiscent of arcades used elsewhere as at Wing. Between the horizontal string course and the ground close observation has brought to light the interesting fact that there is a difference in the material and the handling of the walling between the lowest part and the part that comes

¹ Compare the case of the cubical cap at Brixworth (p. 263).

up to the string course. All the walling of this lower part both as seen above ground and as revealed by Mr Vassall's excavations is in a red stone, while the walling in the upper parts is in stone of a whiter hue. Furthermore the stonework is in this lower part more massive than it is above, and especially at the NE quoin of the nave or crossing the stones are very large and the work monumental in character, and here it may be noted that the quoins at Repton have none of the special Saxon characteristics explained (p. 24) but are made up with comparatively large stones laid flat evenly one above the other. This massive red stone masonry can be followed above and under the ground level from the SE quoin of the nave or crossing right round to the break in the masonry of the N wall of the N transept shown in Fig. 142. There are no pilaster strips connected with this work, but the two S windows noticed above come in it.

It is clear from what has been said that there are at least two distinct periods in the Repton work, and the question is worth asking whether there may not be three.

It will be remembered that Repton, a place of very ancient religious importance, was constituted the royal mausoleum for the Mercian kings in the great era of Mercian power (p. 186). The arrangement of the crypt or lower church with the sepulchral chambers opening from it may be quite early for the scheme is really pre-historic and is found at Mycenae as well as in the Bronze Age tumulus at Newgrange in Ireland. Is it possible that the plan and the lower part of the walling are remains of the royal burial place to which a church, possibly of wood, may have been attached? This must have been destroyed by the Danes when they wintered there in 874. A curious relic of that year's events came to light in 1923 when Mr Vassall in excavating outside near the SE corner of the crossing came at a depth of 5 ft. on a rusted axe head with broken socket. Investigation, and an inquiry to which a kind answer was returned by Dr Haakon Shetelig

of the Museum at Bergen, proved that this was a Viking axe head of a pattern suited to the date just given. The socket had been formed by beating out the metal behind the actual blade into a band which was bent round to form the socket and then welded down to the back of the blade. This weld had given way and given way under the force of a blow driving the axe edge into timber, for on each side of the blade near its edge, but on no other part of the blade, there still remain preserved by the rust some splinters of wood. The head had come off through the fracture of the socket when the edge was driven into the timber and was no doubt left there by the owner of the weapon to be buried ultimately in the soil from which it has been recovered more than a thousand years afterwards. What wood it was in which the axe head became embedded, there at the corner of the church, may be left to the reader's imagination.

We are on surer ground when we come to the red stone church with which may be connected the upper parts of the wall of the lower church and its step-pattern cornice, for this last from its association with Barnack may be dated with assurance in the latter part of X. Such a date would also suit the plan, with its uncertain treatment of the transept which is not a transept, and it would also quite accord with the capital of the column of the respond, Fig. 144, A, for as has been noticed (p. 255) and as will be shown when the time comes to deal with Saxon caps as a whole the form is very crude and unsuited to the round shaft. There is no question however that the upper part of the walling with the pilaster strips is of a later epoch than the red stone part below and to this later epoch may belong the vaulting of the crypt, the capitals in which may for anything we know have been copied from the capitals of the responds. The plan of the crypt takes the columned form that becomes so common in Early Norman times not only in the greater churches but in smaller ones such as St Peter-in-the-East, Oxford, and this

suggests a late date for Repton, though of course there are columned crypts in Europe of earlier origin, as for example that of Jouarre.

Repton crypt naturally turns our thoughts to Wing, Bucks, where a similar undercroft underlies the E end of a remarkable Saxon church of the comparatively rare basilican type. Of existing churches with side aisles two have been noticed, Reculver and Brixworth (pp. 96 f., 105 f.), and there are only three others, Wing; and Lydd, Kent, with the fine late church at Great Paxton, Hunts., which can fairly be reckoned a Saxon building. As we have seen, St Augustine, Canterbury, is not really basilican. We must not however assume that these five examples were the only basilican churches in the country, for we can infer from literary sources that the larger and more important fanes, which have in nearly every case perished, were laid out with these additions. This we know to have been the case with the Saxon Cathedrals at Canterbury and Winchester,¹ with the church at York described by Alcuin, with Wilfrid's churches at Ripon and Hexham, while the mention of a column in the interior of the abbey church at Ramsey² may be taken as evidence in this case also. Lydd may be introduced here as an existing specimen. It appears to be early in Period C. The parish church of Lydd is one of the fine Gothic structures which make the district of the Romney marshes a favourite haunt of the ecclesiologist. Some time ago it was discovered that the NW corner of the N aisle of this well known church consists of part of the N and W walls of an early basilican oratory. Some of the arches and piers of the N arcade of its nave are visible in the present wall (Fig. 145). The span of the arches was about 4 ft., the width of the piers about 3 ft. 4 in. An arched opening about 7 ft. wide can be traced in the W wall, now the end wall of the N aisle of the mediaeval church.

¹ Willis, in the 'Winchester' volume of the Archaeological Institute, p. 15.

² *Chron. Abb. Rames.*, Rolls Series, no. 83, p. 104.

This, it has been suggested by Mr Micklethwaite, who was the first to call attention to the remains,¹ may be the arch of triumph opening into an original western apse. This would furnish an interesting parallel to Silchester, to which perhaps should be added the earliest Canterbury. A r. h. opening, evidently double splayed, exists in the old clearstory at A', of which A gives the plan and B the section. The plan shows the remains with details. C is the later tower.




FIG. 145, Saxon remains at the NW corner of Lydd Church, Kent.

Wing, a large and handsome church in a fine situation, perhaps of the Cnut period in early XI, has preserved its basilican plan, the eastern portion of which is shown in Fig. 146, but has suffered the loss of all its ancient openings, save a small blocked doorway at the end of the N aisle and a very interesting double window with a mid-wall shaft in the E wall of the nave above the presbytery arch, that has been already figured, Fig. 108. The external view of the church, Fig. 147, shows it a handsome modern-looking edifice without any Saxon character which would catch the eye. The later windows and the tower account for this. The polygonal apse is the most prominent feature in the view, and this it will be observed has round it a shallow arcading connecting a series of pilaster strips. Underneath the whole area of this presbytery extends a crypt that will be of special interest in connection with the recent discussion of Repton. Openings from it can be seen low down in the walls of the apse. Indications of a pointed arcade above the r. h. one will be observed. The plan, Fig. 146, shows that the voids, with the necessary piers for the support of the floor above, fill the whole space within the walls of the apse. There is an ambu-

¹ *Archaeological Journal*, LV.

latory, B, the access to which from the upper church was by stairs at A and A', the opening for that at A being still to be seen. Furthermore towards the central chamber of the crypt, C, there opened a window of inspection, or hagioscope, D, visible now in the interior of the chamber, C. Though the church has been much modernized, the old arrangements can





FIG. 146, Eastern end with crypt at Wing.

easily be made out and the levels offer no difficulty. The top of this W opening, or hagioscope, in the crypt is about level with the present floor of the nave and a little E of the chancel arch, so that access to it must have been gained by steps down from the nave-level in the centre of the flight which ascended on each side to the presbytery. This arrangement is indicated on the plan, which represents in parts the result of investigations made when the church was under restora-






FIG. 147, Wing Church, Bucks, from the north-east.

tion, e.g. the shaded parts in the arcade between nave and aisles show what in Saxon times was solid walling. E, E are openings that communicated with external tombs or chambers now destroyed, but resembling no doubt those at Repton.

The history of the crypt in general is well enough illustrated by our Saxon examples. This history exhibits a gradual opening out of originally confined spaces. The single vaulted chamber, a copy of a familiar form of pagan Roman tomb, comes first with its narrow doorways and perhaps a window for inspection. This we have at Ripon and at Hexham. Later on the inner space grows larger perhaps to accommodate an increasing store of relics, and the wall bounding the original chamber is broken up into a series of piers between arched openings giving free access to the chamber or confessio, C at Wing, from an ambulatory. The Wing crypt illustrates this general form. A further stage in the development of the crypt is reached when the heavy piers vanish and the necessary support to the roof is given by columns. This is what the Germans call the 'Hallenkrypta' and it is represented as we have just seen at Repton. From the morphological point of view Repton should accordingly be placed later than Wing.

Finally at Sidbury in Devonshire there has come to light a small crypt of yet another form. Some details of this as well as its relation to the work above it betokens a Saxon origin. It consists in a square chamber measuring about 10 ft. on each side, with a single stair of access towards the nave. This is not in the centre of the W side but N of the centre, so as to leave space to S for a corresponding set of steps up from the level of the nave to the chancel. The floor of this which formed the roof of the crypt must have been of wood, for there are no signs of a vault. No niches or other features have been discovered, Fig. 148. The square ended chancel above is Norman, and the crypt had apparently been filled in when the Norman walls were built, so that this

fact, coupled with clear signs of Saxon technique in the jamb of the opening from the crypt to the stair, is good evidence of date.

As regards type, we have here a form showing a still further advance in the direction of openness than even the columned crypt. This latter is as a rule only approached by two narrow passages, but in the form before us the crypt is open in front to the church and is directly accessible by a comparatively broad stairway. In its monumental development the type is familiar in such




FIG. 148, Crypt at Sidbury, Devon.

examples as those at San Miniato, Florence, and San Zeno, Verona ; and it is interesting to meet with the same type on a minute scale in an English country church.

CHAPTER XII

ARCHITECTURE IN THE THIRD PERIOD: THE USES OF TOWERS AND 'PORTICUS' AND THEIR DISPOSITION IN RELATION TO CHURCH PLANS

A CHRONOLOGICAL survey of the Periods of Saxon architecture subsequent to the first half of VIII, that is to say of Period B extending from the above date to the monastic revival in the last half of X, and of the third Period, C, from the latter date to the first decades after the Norman Conquest, gives us the following results :—

- (1) some plausible examples of the second half of VIII or the early part of IX, Heysham Chapel ; Somerford Keynes ; Sockburn-on-Tees ; Bardsey near Leeds ; and possibly Titchfield, Hants ; but hardly Bishopstone, Sussex ; nor Wroxeter, Salop :
- (2) one or two assignable on fair evidence to the Viking period, Hackness, and Kirby Hill, Yorks. :
- (3) belonging to the early part of X, Deerhurst, Gloucestershire ; and Britford, Wilts :
- (4) the somewhat ambitious examples, Barnack, and Earls Barton, Northants ; Barton-on-Humber, Lincolnshire ; and Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts, which may with fair reason be credited to the time of the monastic revival in the last part of X, when we read of marked building activity in connection with Ramsey Abbey, Hunts. ; and, from chronological indications drawn by analogy or otherwise from some of the above examples, Broughton, and

- Hough-on-the-Hill, Lincs. ; and Dunham Magna, Norfolk ; the first and third much later ;
- (5) in the Cnut period of early XI the unique Greenstead, Essex, but not Hadstock, Essex ;
 - (6) assignable to the years immediately preceding the Conquest, with certainty Deerhurst Chapel, Gloster ; and Kirkdale, Yorks ; by analogy Boarhunt, Hants ;
 - (7) parts of Stow, Lincolnshire, datable with practical certainty to about 1040, and Wulfric's central church at Canterbury to about 1050.

Incidentally it may be mentioned that all existing Saxon crypts and all aisled or basilican churches that survive (save Great Paxton, Hunts.) have now been noticed.

The foregoing review has embraced some fifty characteristic buildings of which about thirty are to be dated with reasonable certainty. On account of general resemblances, a large number of other examples can of course be grouped around those specially mentioned, and most of these can be sufficiently noticed, and where needful illustrated, in the Alphabetical List of Saxon churches given at the end of the volume. There still remain to be considered (1) numerous examples of importance that illustrate, if not strictly speaking the evolution of ground plans, yet a great and interesting variety in the matter of planning and arrangements specially characteristic of Saxon practice ; (2) work in details of a more or less 'advanced' kind, such as recessing, the use of angle shafts, soffit rolls, moulded plinths and the like, together with enriched imposts, capitals, and bases, and (3) what form numerically the largest of all the classes into which Saxon monuments can be grouped, the W towers of the so-called 'Lincolnshire' type, numbering in all about fifty examples, that are in the main Saxon in character but in many cases also possess features of Norman appearance. These last buildings bring us to what has been termed the 'Saxo-Norman overlap,' and in indirect connection also with this there fall

to be noticed (4) one or two buildings of special interest some of which are advanced in type but at the same time not Norman in character, such as Hadstock, Essex ; Great Paxton, Hunts. ; Langford, Oxon ; or like Stoughton, Sussex ; or Ickleton, Cambs., are Norman with marked Saxon features. Under this last heading may be included one or two Scottish examples, notably St Rule's chapel at St Andrews and the tower of Restennet Priory, Forfarshire. The early oratory of which the W tower and nave were brought to light a few years ago under the present nave of Dunfermline is quite Saxon in character though built after the Conquest (p. 251).

Relaxing now the effort to preserve chronological sequence, we will envisage the monuments mainly from the point of view of the evolution of ground plans. We have among these, as at Heysham Chapel, examples of the simplest possible plans such as those of the earliest Celtic oratories (p. 42) and we possess also basilican and fully developed cruciform edifices still purely Saxon. Are these, we may ask, the outcome of a continuous process of development that can be followed through successive stages, or is Saxon architectural work so unsystematic as to make inapplicable the scientific terms 'development' and 'evolution'? If these terms are to carry with them the idea of a strict succession in time for all the changes in church plans through the Saxon period they should not be employed, or should only be used in a sense understood to be quite general. As here utilized the terms do not necessarily involve chronological assumptions, and allow that more elaborate forms are not always later than simpler ones. The plain nave and square ended chancel make up the quite late example at Coln Rogers, Gloucestershire, as they make up the early Escomb, and basilican Brixworth in VII is larger and more elaborate than basilican Wing in XI. With this caution in mind we may now proceed to examine the principal modifications of simpler normal plans as we meet with them in Saxon England. These modifica-

tions are abundant and varied and though we feel that the Saxon builders are wanting in the spirit of system so strong among their Norman successors, we do not find them mere commonplace plodders but men of ideas and activity, who are conscious in their own way of the general European advance towards the establishment of the Romanesque style, but who are undisciplined, and try all sorts of experiments in planning, which, as we have seen in the case of Deerhurst, set us curious problems in interpretation and give interest of a very real kind to their work.

The architectural elements that in their growth, their changes, and their shifting relations make the interest of this part of our subject are the western porch, the lateral porch or chapel, and the tower. The first as its name implies is a constant feature. The second, not always sure whether to be porch or chapel—that is whether there shall be a door into it from the outside or only communication with the church—remains always lateral but moves up and down from west to east in restless fashion till finally settling down at the eastern end of the nave it insensibly assumes the form and function of a transept as a constituent member of the cruciform scheme. The tower, as we have seen a later addition to the church fabric that in the first period had no place or use for it, from the time when in IX or X it first makes its appearance is a very frequent feature, but apparently not entirely welcome for there seems no place prepared for it. We can watch it constantly shifting its position, and perching now here and now there on the main fabric or on the porches and chapels just mentioned, as if it were not an integral part of the general scheme of the monument when originally planned. In certain cases it seems to claim practical independence and becomes itself the church housing the congregation in its ground story. At other times it craves the support of the western or the lateral porch on the walls of which it rears its lofty bulk, and will advance from the

west along the nave to the axis of which it keeps while it covers now the western now the eastern section of this and going further surmounts at times the chancel. An example, where there is a Saxo-Norman overlap, at Stoughton in Sussex shows it even rising above the southern transept. An alliance may be formed with the central feature of the early cruciform or polygonal church, or the pavilion which in the case of early Merovingian churches of about V and VI in Gaul is thought by some to have marked the square where nave and transept cross,¹ and there results the lordly central tower over the crossing of the fully developed Romanesque cruciform monument. The feature may of course also be duplicated so that there is a western as well as a central tower (p. 268) or twin towers may flank the western façade and compose with a central pavilion (p. 269). So prominent a feature in Saxon architecture does the tower become that the Norman builders accepted it as an institution of their new home and allowed Saxon fashions in this matter to influence their own constructive schemes.

The simplest of all the forms here noticed is the western porch, for this occurring for the first time at St Pancras, Canterbury, and then later in VII at Brixworth and perhaps at St Peter-on-the-Wall (p. 103), and in the North at Monkwearmouth and Corbridge, possibly too at Escomb (p. 142), and also at a date that cannot be so definitely fixed at Bardsey, Yorks.; and Titchfield, Hants, is just an abbreviated form of the columned porticus, the fourth side of the atrium or forecourt, through which the Early Christian basilica was normally entered. With this Early Christian atrium were connected various ecclesiastical buildings and offices among which the Baptistry was naturally prominent,² and J. T. Micklethwaite believed that lateral doors out of western porches, as at Monk-

¹ De Lasteyrie is sceptical about this—see his chapter XII.

² At Parenzo in Istria there is a small atrium before the church, out of which on its western side a baptistry opens.

wearmouth, Brixworth, Netheravon, etc., generally led to adjuncts of this kind. That such adjuncts also served funereal purposes we can gather from what Bede tells us of the 'porticus ingressus' at Monkwearmouth,¹ as well as from the story about the sepulchre of St Swithun at Winchester.² The assembling of these adjuncts at the entrance end of the church in connection with its porch represents as we have just seen an Early Christian tradition, but there are additional points of interest that emerge when the porch is surmounted or replaced by a tower.

We must distinguish between the purely architectural and the ecclesiological aspects of the W tower. The former—form, details, and technique—are matters that have special interest in connection with the Saxo-Norman overlap already spoken of and consideration of them may be deferred. The internal arrangements of the towers on the other hand, and the practical purposes contemplated in these, are matters of purely Saxon interest and meet us as soon as the W tower makes its first appearance at Deerhurst and Brixworth, so that the treatment of them need not be delayed.

I. ECCLESIOLOGY OF THE WESTERN TOWER

That occupation and residence were among these purposes has been already brought under the reader's notice in connection especially with Deerhurst and Brixworth. The chambers at a high level in the former church and at a lower elevation in the latter, each opening towards the church in some state with a highly decorated aperture, appear to have served for the accommodation of persons of distinction. Who were these persons we may ask. There is a treatise by the Carolingian statesman Eginhard, in which he tells of certain miracles wrought in the basilica he had erected about

¹ *Historia Abbatum*, c. 20.

² 'Winchester' Volume of the Archaeological Institute, p. 6.

830 at Seligenstadt, then Mühlheim, on the Main. In the upper story of the western choir he possessed what he calls a 'coenaculum' or upper chamber in which was an altar and which he used for his own accommodation during the services.¹ When we reflect on the position assumed towards the churches of the later Saxon period by the great men of their localities (see Vol. 1, p. 324 f.) we may picture to ourselves the local landowner at Deerhurst or Brixworth following the example of the Carolingian statesman and establishing himself in a coenaculum at the western end of the local oratory, after the fashion of an English lord or squire of much more recent days. Brixworth was at first monastic and Deerhurst was monastic to the end, but a small monastery often depended on the local lord, and in any case the western end of its church was generally for the use of the lay population. Brixworth may have been restored by the ealderman of the place even prior to the time of Edgar, for the Saxon work of the restoration shows none of the often-noticed later features of Period C.

This suggestion of the use of these upper chambers by some local magnate cannot be dissociated from the question of the purpose of the somewhat elaborate arrangements in the ground story of the W tower at Barnack, with its recessed throne-like seat flanked once with stone benches that would accommodate some forty persons. A court of some kind with its president and assessors is naturally suggested (p. 282).

These spaces in towers would be for temporary or ceremonial use, but there were domiciles of a humbler kind for residence. As was noticed in a previous volume, Vol. 1, p. 334, we must postulate that it was not always, not perhaps even often, that the denizen was the priest in charge. It was there suggested, p. 339, that the occupant was as a rule the ostiarius or sacristan, who kept the doors, safeguarded the relics, and attended to the bells of the church, being bidden in some cases to 'ly over nyghtes therin.' A lodging on the

¹ Migne, *Pat. Curs. Compl.*, civ, pp. 559, 565, 593.

first story of the tower would keep him in touch with the bells, and give him a place of vantage from which to command the altar with its treasures at the other end of the building. In two existing Saxon towers, Deerhurst and Bosham, there are small apertures in the E wall of the tower that were probably intended for the purpose of affording a view in this direction.

In other cases the lodging on the first story of the tower seems quite suitable for a priest in charge, as in the following example.

One of the most cogent pieces of evidence of former habitation in these chambers of pre-Conquest towers occurs at Skipwith, Yorks., where in the E wall of the ringing chamber is a shallow recess 3 ft. high and 3 ft. 5 in. wide, the sill of it about 2 ft. from the present floor. Its depth is 6 in. The jambs are formed by round shafts each in a single stone with square abaci, quite of pre-Conquest type. It is to be noted that a small double splayed window has been specially formed in the S wall of the tower just where it would throw light on whatever was kept in, or used at, the recess. The absence of any parallel elsewhere makes it difficult to conjecture the purpose of the arrangement. It may have been a receptacle for a relief, such as a carved rood, or a panel like those now preserved in Chichester cathedral. See Fig. 149. In one of the upper stages of the tower at Deerhurst will be remembered two aumbry-like recesses in the N and S walls that are also signs of earlier habitation.

The various openings, which in some of these towers are pretty numerous and on different levels, are important as evidence for the manner in which the structures were used in the olden time. There are at present stories in the towers formed at different levels by wooden floors, the beams of which rest sometimes on projecting corbels of mediaeval date, as at Bardsey, Yorks. Only in the case of one existing Saxon tower does the lowest stage possess a contemporary

stone vault.¹ This is at Monkwearmouth, but the vault here belongs to the earlier porch and not to the tower. In every other case the lowest stage of the tower, readily accessible through the W door or the open tower arch, is or was only roofed with wood. Access to this and to the stages above is gained by wooden ladders, some of which (not of Saxon date) are excellent specimens of rude but solid wood




FIG. 149, Recess in chamber in the western tower at Skipwith, Yorkshire.

At A is the section of the lintel of the recess.

work. The first story is generally now the ringing chamber, and from this into the church there commonly opens a doorway which as at present placed is a somewhat puzzling detail.

These upper doorways in Saxon towers are features so familiar as to be almost universal,² and the first Norman

¹ With later mediaeval vaults inserted in Saxon towers, as has been the case at Barnack, we have of course no concern.

² There are some exceptional towers, such as Warden, Northumberland, that have no upper opening of the kind.

builders took them over with all the other features which they adopted from their despised predecessors, but they are in no connection with anything to be seen at present within the churches. They cannot be regarded as merely apertures to




FIG. 150, Western end of nave (eastern face of tower), Bosham, Sussex. From a sketch by the late J. T. Irvine.

afford a view of the interior, for at Deerhurst and Bosham there exist by the side of the doorways small openings or squints which seem to have had this very object (Fig. 150). The purpose of the doorways is clearly to serve as means of entrance and exit, and they might conceivably be designed to afford access by means of a ladder from the floor of the church to the chamber in the tower. At Monkwearmouth the only access to

the chamber above, which was part of the original porch, is by a ladder up to this doorway shown in the sketch, Fig. 60. It is possible that some of the doorways in the towers generally were used in the same manner, though this can only have been the case when they were at no great height above the ground. In Fig. 151 are given outlines to scale of the internal features at the W end of the naves of three charac-

teristic examples, (A) Bosham, (B) St Peter-at-Gowts, Lincoln, and (C) Deerhurst. Bosham and Deerhurst, which show the small squints for inspection, have the corresponding doorways on lines respectively 18 ft. and 16 ft. above the floor, but in the Lincoln example where the tower arch is very lofty the height is 26 ft. and a doorway at that elevation can




FIG. 151. Outlines of W ends of three Saxon churches with W towers, showing openings in the E faces of the towers, A, Bosham; B, St Peter-at-Gowts, Lincoln; C, Deerhurst.

hardly have been conveniently used for access from the floor of the church.

There are two other suggestions that have been made about these doorways. One is that they were used for egress rather than entrance and communicated with spaces between the ceilings and the outer roofs of the churches. Chambers between under and upper roofs are features in some of the Irish stone churches of native origin and occur also over chancels in Norman work in England, as at Darenth, Kent ;

Tickencote, Rutland ; and Compton, Surrey. There is, as we shall see in connection with the W adjunct at Barton-on-Humber, evidence of this arrangement in some Saxon examples where the side walls of the building are low, but in the case of large churches with lofty side walls the doorways above the tower arches would not be at a sufficient elevation, and the third suggestion is that they afforded access from the tower to wooden galleries erected against the W ends of churches. It appears that this has been the case at Deerhurst, where some moulded stones that project from the W wall of the nave at a level just below the doorway may have had some connection with a gallery, and on the whole this theory may be accepted as the explanation which probably covers the largest number of instances.¹

In the case of those towers which possess similar doorways to these under question at a much higher level, there can be little doubt that they opened into spaces between an upper and an under roof. At Bosham (A) Fig. 151, the height of the nave walls, 29 ft., seems to point to this explanation of the upper doorway, but the most convincing example is Norton, Co. Durham (p. 357). At Deerhurst too, as we have seen, if the upper dotted lines in the drawing (C) Fig. 151 indicate the ancient Saxon roof at an elevation of about 60 ft., we get the high doorway into a position suitable for this same purpose. The present roof of the Perpendicular epoch cuts as will be seen right across the doorway, but the weather tabling on the E face of the tower seems to give a suitable line for the Saxon one.

¹ In connection with the possible uses of the various parts of these W towers Mr Micklethwaite appended a note to his paper in the *Archaeological Journal*, vol. LIII. In this paper, on p. 337, he writes : ' Western galleries were common, and the doorways leading to them from the towers may often be seen. . . . It may be that these galleries were used for the night offices by men who lived in the towers and in lofts connected with them, and who could in that way enter the church without going down stairs, or down ladders, which was then the more common use.'

The case of Earls Barton is similar and the r. h. doorway on the E side of the tower about 25 ft. from the ground opened at one time under the original external roof of the church.

A witness to the former existence of these chambers high up under the roof exists at Godalming, Surrey. As has recently been shown,¹ there was here a Saxon nave 31 ft. 6 in. long corresponding with the two E bays of the present nave, and a chancel that is now the ground story of the later axial tower. High up under the E gable of the nave and now visible with some difficulty from the bell chamber of the tower are two small double splayed circular windows that once lighted this upper chamber, and of course were above the former external roof of the chancel. At Avebury, Wilts, there are Saxon windows in two stories the uppermost of which, see Fig. 17, may have lighted an upper chamber of the kind. There is no Saxon W tower here to help us. Arreton, Isle of Wight, has similarly arranged windows, but it had no Saxon tower (p. 442).

We have not however completed the study of these tower apertures, for they occur on other faces besides that turned towards the church, and sometimes indicate the presence of adjuncts built up against the towers. Thus at Deerhurst there is a doorway 25 ft. above the ground on the W face, that looks as if it had opened once on to the roof of some W adjunct to the tower.² At Netheravon in Wiltshire there is a W tower, Late Saxon in general style but with Norman features, that has distinct indications of the existence on the W, N, and S faces of former adjuncts, the purpose of which is problematical. The plan, Fig. 152, shows the attachment of these lateral walls which are now broken away. On the northern face, about 17 ft. above the ground, there is an

¹ *The Parish Church . . . of Godalming. Notes on the Structure*, by S. Welman, Godalming, 1921.

² Mr Mickelthwaite suggested a chamber over a baptistry, l.c., p. 347.

opening cut like a doorway, but only 4 ft. 9 in. high, that may have given on to the roof of one of these subsidiary buildings.¹ At Warblington, Hampshire, a square tower of rude workmanship now embedded in a beautiful church of later date, has doorways of this kind on the N, S, and W faces at a height of about 15 ft. from the ground.

Such openings when on the plain faces of towers may




FIG. 152, Netheravon Tower.

always indicate the former existence of some adjunct, but the case is very different when the face of the tower below the opening is somewhat elaborately enriched. This is the case at Earls Barton tower (see Frontispiece), and here the doorway on the S face, measuring 7 ft. by 2 ft. 6 in., offers egress from near the floor

of the ringing chamber. The external aperture however is at a giddy height above the ground, and there is no apparent sign of any gallery or platform to which it may once have afforded access. The decorative treatment of the face of the tower below the opening seems to preclude the idea that any adjunct was ever built up against it. The current explanation of these external doorways on other faces beside E, which seems plausible in such cases as Deerhurst and Netheravon, does not appear to apply at Earls Barton, and the interpretation of the openings here is doubtful.

Within the towers the usual means of access to their upper stages must have been, as we have seen, wooden ladders or narrow fixed stair-flights; there are however four examples of spiral staircases of stone enclosed in half or three-quarter round turrets built up against the W walls of square towers of Saxon type. The instances are Brigstock and Brixworth,

¹ There is a paper on Netheravon by Mr C. E. Ponting, in the *Wiltshire Magazine* for 1901, from which some features of the plan have been derived.

Northamptonshire ; with Hough-on-the-Hill by Grantham, and Broughton by Brigg in Lincolnshire, while the case of the rather enigmatical N Elmham, Norwich, may also be added (p. 345). The general appearance of the turrets can be seen in Fig. 49. One of the towers of the 'Lincolnshire' group, Great Hale, by Sleaford, is exceptional in that it possesses a narrow turret stair in the thickness of the wall at the NE angle of the tower. The stairway is only 1 ft. 4 in. wide, and the construction is of a very rude and tentative kind. The triangle of masonry in the corner was not quite large enough to hold the cylinder for the stair, and the tower bulges a little on the E face to give it room. The plan at the belfry stage is given in Fig. 153. This tower though at first sight primitive looking was probably erected after the Conquest.




FIG. 153, Belfry stage,
Great Hale, Lincoln-
shire.

No more space can be allotted to the discussion of what may be called the ecclesiology of the Saxon W tower, as distinct from its architecture which will be taken up later on (p. 385 f.). It may be repeated here that the feature in question was certainly a good deal more than a mere belfry or a mere stair turret or even a propugnaculum or place of defence or of refuge. Taken with the adjuncts attached to or opening out of it it may fairly, like the porch that preceded it, be compared with the atrium of the Early Christian basilica which gave access to various subsidiary structures of ecclesiastical use as well as to the great church, and indeed in the view of that excellent writer Dr Julius Schlosser was the parent of the later monastic cloister court, out of which opened common-rooms, refectories, dormitories, and the like apart from the abbey church. These characteristics give to the tower the position of a fore-building and justify us in discerning the

origin of it in the important W structure at Aachen (p. 234 f.). Reasons have been given for reckoning Brixworth and Deerhurst the earliest of our towers and they are both western and both complex and connected with adjuncts.

II. AXIAL AND LATERAL TOWERS

What has been said about the W tower as an ecclesiastical residence and office applies also to the tower in other positions, lateral, axial,¹ or central. Existing examples of these have the same doorways on their faces that we have now got to know, and where the tower itself has disappeared the parts of the building on which it abutted exhibit the doors of communication suspended in the air. Such towers seem all to have been arranged to serve the same sort of purpose as the W fore-buildings. The evidence is clearest in the case of towers forming the body of the church (Barton-on-Humber, Broughton), but other towers in a central position have these doorways for entrance and egress above the arches on the ground story, and there may be adduced as examples Langford, Oxon; Norton, Durham; Repton, Derbyshire (with a wide opening above chancel arch probably from a central tower); Wootton Wawen, Warwickshire. The upper parts of the lateral towers at Christ Church, Canterbury, probably of X, were no doubt thus used, and where the tower stands over a part of the nave this also applies. At Daglingworth, Gloucestershire, there is evidence derived from an old inventory² that an upper story in the axial tower was used for a residence.

In the case of the tower forming the body of the church, there is conclusive evidence at Barton-on-Humber not that the tower was lived in, though this may have been the case,

¹ By 'axial' is meant a tower that subtends some portion of the main axis, practically the nave, of the church. It is explained on (p. 342).

² *Transactions of Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, xii. 64.

but that doorways in its upper walls communicated with the roof chambers already illustrated. Such doorways are shown in the E and W tower walls in the section, Fig. 154, and there were evidently chambers entered through these, that over the W adjunct being lighted by the upper circular window in the W wall. If there were no floor in the tower below these, such as now exists, an ascent must have been made to the




FIG. 154, Section of tower and W adjunct, Barton-on-Humber.

doorways on each occasion by ladders from the church itself, a highly awkward arrangement. There must have been a similar installation at Broughton. See also (p. 346).

If Deerhurst possessed a central tower, its upper stages would naturally come into connection with the transeptal chapels which flank the nave in this part, and which possessed upper stories where there were openings to N and S that now have no meaning but may once have communicated with the tower.

Regarding now these towers more architecturally, in their connection with church plans, a certain number may be

grouped together under the name 'axial,' for they always stand at some point between W and E along the main axis of the building. They differ from the ordinary W tower and from the tower that forms the body of the church in that they are of the same width as the rest of the nave, over a portion of which they stand, whereas the others are either narrower or wider, and they must be distinguished also from the fully developed central tower of a cruciform plan where it is in integral connection with the four arms of the cross, while the axial tower has no lateral connections.¹

There is this peculiarity about these axial towers, that they were not necessarily prepared for by any thickening of the walls on which their weight would rest, so that we cannot always tell whether a particular square space was covered by a tower or not (pp. 216, 313). The axial tower over the W end of a nave is however generally so prepared for, which may be explained by the fact that the W tower proper was a well understood feature before the W axial tower was essayed. At Boarhunt (p. 309) there is no thickening of walls, but then the space cut off is not square in plan, and does not suggest a tower. At Daglingworth the walls of the W division which *is* a square are thicker by c. 11 in. than they are further E. Here, as in other examples of the W axial tower,² the feature in its lower part makes no appearance on the exterior but proclaims itself or its former presence in the interior by this thickening of the walls as well as by the transverse wall that carries its E face and opened towards the E part of the nave in a wide arch. At Diddlebury or Delbury, Salop, a Saxon church with Norman additions (p. 245), there is a W axial tower of Norman and later dates but this seems to be only the carrying out of a Saxon scheme, for along the

¹ A tower, not fully carried up, over the S transept of the Saxo-Norman church at Stoughton, Sussex, is exceptional, but may be regarded as lateral.

² As for example Northchurch, Herts (p. 473).

foot of the Saxon N wall on the exterior runs a plinth of three square orders, and this continues without a break from the original E quoin of the Saxon nave to the present NW quoin of the W tower. The walling of the tower above does not however look Saxon and the thickness of the original Saxon tower walls, if ever built, cannot be ascertained.

The fine church of Hooton Pagnell, near Doncaster, possesses now a W tower, a nave with a N aisle and an extensive chancel. The W third of the last, the nave, and the ground story of the tower on S are built in rubble work that might well be of Saxon date, and this work extends on the tower to a height a little greater than that of the nave walls. There is a recessed tower arch and an early looking chancel arch but the construction of these is rather Norman than Saxon and the church as a whole is probably post-Conquest, though the axial tower which is flush with the side walls of the nave is Saxon in plan if not partly in structure. Here there is a distinct thickening of the walls of the nave where the tower comes. The same we see (p. 311) to have been the case at S Elmham in Suffolk. Another E Anglian church, also an Elmham and as enigmatical as its namesake, North Elmham in the heart of Norfolk a few miles N of E Dereham, presents us with a ruin of which Fig. 155 gives the general plan. With the Elmhams, N and S, are connected questions of the local ecclesiastical history that could only be treated on the basis of a competent knowledge of E Anglian lore to which the present writer makes no pretence. Alike in Saxon and in Norman times both places were connected with the E Anglian see or sees, and a claim has been made for N Elmham that it was once an E Anglian bishop's church. No pre-Conquest details can be identified in its existing architecture, but there is a chronological indication in the fact that the earthworks of an early Norman burh or moated mound almost overlie its W end and in all likelihood are posterior to it in date. Assuming then provisionally that




FIG. 155, Plan of church at N Elmham, Norfolk.

it is Saxon we may notice certain novel and interesting features about its plan.

There is a long narrow aisleless nave ending in a transept, in the E wall of which is the arch of the presbytery opening into an apse. The plan is thus an example of the 'crux commissa' noticed in connection with Hexham (p. 168 f.). W of the transept, and opening into the nave through doorways, are two chapels.¹ A curious technical peculiarity is to be observed in the filling of the re-entrant angles on the plan with buttress-like pieces of the shape of quarter cylinders. These are to all appearance of contemporary date with the walling. For the purpose on hand we are chiefly concerned with the W end. Here is a part divided off from the rest of the nave, with which it communicates through one opening 10 ft. wide instead of by two openings as at S Elmham. The walls of this sundered portion are about 5 ft. thick, whereas the walls generally measure 3 ft. 3 in. This fact in itself suggests a tower, and the presumption is raised almost to certainty by the existence at its SE corner of a projecting turret half-round in plan containing the remains of a spiral stair. Such a stair turret on the W face of a tower occurs, we have seen, in several examples of Saxon date. Here at N Elmham the position suggests that of the flanking stair turrets so common in German work, but the feature is single and not double.

There is good reason to regard the axial W tower as a Saxon form perpetuated in England in Norman times. It is worth notice that in German Romanesque there are some examples of the scheme, and one or two are indicated below.²

¹ The N chapel has been much pulled about, and in its external outline it may originally have corresponded with that to S. The whole building is encumbered by additions and alterations of later date, and the plan here given can only be taken as provisional.

² Clemen, *Die Kunstdenkmäler der Rheinprovinz*, I, 4, Bedburg by Cleve; III, 2, Gruiten by Elberfeld; IV, 4, Dürscheven by Euskirchen.

Following now the axial tower eastwards, we find it between nave and chancel at Dunham Magna in Norfolk, a well preserved Saxon building of much interest. The triangular headed W door, now blocked, is seen in the view Fig. 156, and the shallow arcading which runs round the wall of the nave in the interior, already noticed in connection with the similar feature on the exterior of Bradford-on-Avon, was shown in Fig. 135 (p. 301). On that page it was noted that it must be of later date than the external arcading at Bradford, and that it shows indeed Norman details. The belfry openings in Dunham Magna tower are of the type of those in the 'Lincolnshire' towers, but have very advanced caps and bases to the mid-wall shafts. See Fig. 194, *e*. On the other hand its quoins exhibit the l. and s. work which the 'Lincolnshire' towers have parted with. The straight-sided head of the W doorway looks early but the pilasters on the jambs have a billet ornament that reminds us of Sompington and is certainly late. The church may be dated mid-XI. The plan of the church is given in Fig. 157, but the chancel, which is said to have ended apsidally,¹ is of later work. It is to be noticed that the N and S walls of the tower are on the exterior flush with the walls of the nave but they are thicker, so that the interior space under the tower is less in width than the nave by about 2 ft. The E l. and s. quoins of the tower come clear to the ground but the W ones stop when they reach the summit of the walls of the nave.

Besides Dunham Magna there is no other church with axial tower between nave and chancel that is so completely Saxon, and that enables us to make direct comparison between the thickness of the tower wall and that of the other part of the nave, but hard by at Newton, close to Castle Acre, there is another axial tower of Saxon date that stands between a later nave wider than itself and a chancel, and at Langford in Oxfordshire a very fine church of post-Conquest date enshrines

¹ Archaeological Institute, 'Norwich' volume, 1851, p. 216.





FIG. 156, Dunham Magna, Norfolk, from the north-west.

(To face p. 346.)



a Saxon axial tower that has features worthy of remark, and must be noticed in connection with the Saxo-Norman overlap. Waith near Grimsby, Lincolnshire, and Northleigh, Oxfordshire, have what were once Saxon axial towers but are now in later setting, and the same is probably true of Guildford, Surrey. Here a massive tower with double splayed lights and pilaster strips is embosomed in later structures, but as the strips come down to the ground on the N and S sides where they are visible now inside the church, it is clear that these sides of the tower were once external.

The ground story of a tower used as a chancel, a rarer




FIG. 157, Plan of Dunham Magna, Norfolk.

plan than the one just noted, occurs in Saxon work at Weybourne in the north of Norfolk, and the tower of Godalming church, Surrey, before the modern alterations, bore clear evidence that it stands above what was once the chancel of the earlier church.

The Saxon tower of St Peter, Bedford, occupies a rather curious position. It is now axial, but the chancel which it precedes is of greater width by about a foot than the tower. The chancel may conceivably have been the original nave and the tower a W one, while there are signs at the W face of the tower that there was once some building joined to it in this part. The E face of the tower possessed a triangular-headed opening on the first story corresponding to the openings already studied in the E walls of W towers above tower arches,

and this fact lends force to the suggestion just made. The opening is visible now in the interior of the tower.

III. CENTRAL TOWERS AND THE CRUCIFORM SCHEME

The axial tower has only connections E and W while N and S its walls are flush with the lines of the nave, as at Dunham Magna, and any openings in these walls would give on the open air. The central tower as its name implies has relations with the parts of the church to N and S, and to understand the position of such a tower we must know what these parts are and how they stand in relation to the building as a whole.

The simplest form of the N or S feature of a church is the side chapel which we find at St Pancras and probably at St Martin, Canterbury (p. 81). At first these lateral adjuncts were located in the middle or the western part of the length of the nave, though in the example of St Peter and St Paul they have already taken their position eastward. At Britford (p. 221) and Deerhurst (p. 208) which we have assigned to early X the lateral adjuncts are located at the E end of the nave, and while at the former place the low enriched openings seem to indicate small chapels at the latter the spaces are of considerable size, but on the ground floor at any rate have no imposing entry from the nave. Lateral adjuncts of similar dimensions occur in the same position in the important example of Repton and each seems to have opened by two arches to the nave. There are also here indications, furnished mainly by the big opening in the E wall over the chancel arch, that the cruciform scheme thus suggested was emphasized by the central feature of a tower, while at Deerhurst also there are similar evidences of one, but in neither case is there thickening of the walls such as occurs at Dunham Magna. At Bradford-on-Avon the adjuncts are only porch chapels of the older Canterbury type and open to the nave through narrow doorways. There is here no possibility of a tower.




FIG. 158, Plan of Breamore Church, Hants.

On the other hand in two notable churches which may be of late X or early XI date we do find a distinct approach to a cruciform scheme with central tower, in the one case adumbrated in the other carried out with some measure of consistency. These churches are Breamore, Hants, and St Mary, Dover Castle, Kent, and the plans are given Figs. 158, 161.

Breamore, a spacious and handsome church, 96 ft. 6 in.




FIG. 159, Breamore Church, Hants, from SW.

long with a nave width of 20 ft. 6 in., Saxon throughout save for the S porch which is of later date, has only been recognized as such within the last quarter of a century. The recognition was due to the Rev. A. du Boulay Hill, who has done so much work on the Saxon churches and carved stones of Notts. and other districts. He described the church in the *Archaeological Journal*.¹ It has double splayed windows, pilaster strips (Fig. 94, p. 241), and irregular l. and s. work in the quoins. There have to be added to the plan on N a

¹ Vol. lv, p. 84 f.

lateral adjunct similar to that on S for the mark of the gable of the former is still apparent on the N wall, and also in all probability a W adjunct of some kind, the N wall of which has left traces and to which a W door of which there are indications below ground opened from the nave. The present W wall has been rebuilt. Fig. 159 shows the exterior aspect of the E part of the nave when seen from S. Over the S door there was originally a stone Rood with three figures in relief,




FIG. 160, Inscribed archway into S chapel, Breamore.

but as happened also at Headborne Worthy, Hants, the relief has been cut away to the level of the wall.

The lateral adjunct on S, seen in the view, is from the exterior quite worthy to be termed a transept, yet the archway leading to it from the nave is only 4 ft. 5 in. wide with a height of about 10 ft.

This archway, Fig. 160, is of sufficient interest to repay a short digression. The wall in which it is pierced is 3 ft. thick, the voussoirs but not the jambs are formed of




FIG. 161, Plan of Saxon Church of St Mary, Dover Castle.

through-stones. Its Saxon origin may be argued from the inscription in Old English which appears round the arch, and should be divided as follows HER SWUTELAD SEO GECWYDRÆDNES ÐE. It was formerly thought that the words read 'Here is made manifest the covenant to thee,' and that the door may have opened into the baptistry ; but more recently Prof. Napier suggested¹ that the last word does not mean 'to thee,' but is simply the relative 'which,' and that the inscription was continued elsewhere, perhaps over the door into the opposite N chapel.

It will be noted that the presence of the central tower here is obvious in the exterior view, but in the interior, though there is a W tower arch (the former presence of which is indicated at Deerhurst (p. 216) though it is not now visible) there is no thickening of the wall, but the W quoin of the tower at Breamore is carried down to the ground and shows on the outer face of the wall, which is not the case at Dunham Magna.

The plan of St Mary-in-the-Castle at Dover, Fig. 161,² is similar to that of Breamore and its internal length is about 117 ft. There is no thickening of walls, but there is a very bold, even a grand, tower arch as well as a similar chancel arch, and the tower externally rises to a commanding height though the uppermost portion is later. The Rev. John Puckle, in his valuable little book (p. 265) which deals with the building about 1860 before its re-roofing and restoration, notices the solid and careful work of the foundations, and says on his p. 21 of the 'lofty arches of both nave and chancel' that they 'are as firm and true now as when they first rose from their springing.' The walls on which the

¹ *Transactions of Philological Society*, 1903-6, p. 293.

² Fig. 161 is based on a plan in the Irvine drawings. The church is sometimes figured without any indication of transeptal arches, but with the transepts quite open as at Peterborough. The existence of a central tower shows however that there must have been walls here with openings into the transepts, otherwise the tower could not have been carried. The width of the Saxon openings is not known. The present transeptal arches are of the twelfth century.

tower rests are 3 ft. thick composed of stone and brick and there are no buttresses. The openings from the tower N and S to the transepts are the work of XII and seem to have replaced the original Saxon arches, because, as Mr Micklethwaite suggested, 'the original openings, whatever they may have been, were not thought large enough.'¹ This is a natural supposition in view of the narrow transeptal openings at Breamore and earlier at Deerhurst, and if it is a true one it would mean that the XII builders were not afraid to weaken by wider arches the ground story of the tower. The writer just quoted believed that the old Roman Pharos, or lighthouse tower, close to the W end of the church was worked into the general scheme so as to serve as a W tower² thus reproducing the X plan of Ramsey (p. 268). Fig. 162, above, gives an idea of the effect. In this view it will be noticed that the tower has at last attained the predominance as central feature that it is destined to hold in British mediaeval architecture for centuries to come, as evidenced at Saxo-Norman Westminster, at Durham, Canterbury, Lincoln, etc., yet the lateral adjunct has by no means yet assumed its full importance as co-ordinate in breadth and height with the nave and as part of the free open interior spaces of the church.

There is nothing definitely to indicate a date for Dover, though of course it must fall within our Period C, and it is probably of early XI.

The next example showing an advance on Dover in the treatment of the lateral spaces is Stow in Lincolnshire, and to the parts that are significant for the present purpose a date can on historical evidence be assigned. The notable monument lies near the old Roman road called Tillbridge Lane which diverges from the main Roman thoroughfare northwards from Lincoln and runs westwards to the Trent which it crosses not far from Stow, and consists in an aisleless nave and chancel and a central tower against which abut

¹ *Arch. Journ.* LIII, 327.

² *ibid.*




FIG. 162, above, St Mary, Dover Castle, with Pharos, from W.
below, Stanton Lacy, Salop, N wall and N transept.

(To face p. 354.)



transepts of equal height with nave and chancel and of considerable length. To this dignified structure there is attached a lordly tradition of early origin and episcopal rank,¹ but we really know nothing about it till near the year 1040, when the then bishop of Dorchester, with the bountiful aid of Leofric and Godiva, set up there a religious establishment apparently of secular canons. We also hear of it about fifty years later, when Remigius the Norman bishop of Lincoln states in a charter that he has decided to renovate the place which was in a state of decay through the lapse of time and the neglect of those in charge.² The present nave is generally reputed to be his work, while the fine vaulted chancel³ is attributed to Bishop Alexander in the first half of XII. The Saxon work is confined to the transepts and the lower part of the central tower with its arches, and as regards the dates of the different parts of this work, the piers of the tower arches on all four sides, see the plan Fig. 163, are certainly Saxon though of an advanced type. They have the Saxon pilaster strips, though the inner one is worked into a half round section like that on the Late Saxon or Saxo-Norman tower at Sompington, Sussex, or the tower arches at Skipwith, Yorks.; and at St Benet, Cambridge. These piers at Stow, Lincolnshire, and the rest of the lower stages of the original tower may with security be dated about 1040, and the same date would suit the transepts. These have been claimed to be relics of a much earlier church, the Saxon cathedral of the diocese of Lindsey established in VII, but their walls rest on a somewhat advanced plinth of two chamfered orders, while their quoins are in finished big-stone work, see Figs. 3, 4, and (p. 25), and both of these features belong to Period C.

¹ Cf. Rev. G. Atkinson, on Stow Church, in *Ass. Soc. Reports*, II, 315, and *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1863/1, 755. Also Dugdale, *Mon.*, III, s.v. Eynsham.

² *Ecclesiam . . . in loco qui vulgo dicitur Stowa, quondam prolixo temporis spatio praesidentium incuriâ desolatam, reformare decerno.* Dugdale, *Mon.*, III, 14.

³ The present vault is a reconstruction.

On the other hand the archivolts which rest upon the tower piers are reckoned to be Early Norman of the date of the nave, while the upper stages of the tower are much later, a XV structure having been erected on its own piers and arches inside the older ones.

The chronological indications afforded at Stow are valuable as giving a date which corresponds to the stage in




FIG. 163, Sketch-plan of central tower at Stow, Lincolnshire, with parts adjacent.

evolution reached by the forms to which the date applies. The normal cruciform church with central tower so far as its arrangement is concerned appears complete, for the transepts range with the nave and chancel in the exterior view and their spaces are in the interior thrown freely into the common stock. With Stow must be compared the cruciform church at Norton near Stockton in Durham. Here a massive Saxon central tower is pierced on its four faces with wide arches in some of which the original Saxon jambs and archivolts have

been altered, while of the originally Saxon nave, chancel, and transepts only the N transept remains in fair preservation the rest having been altered or rebuilt. Fig. 164 gives an idea of its external appearance.¹ The marks of the original roofs abutting against the tower are valuable as showing the




FIG. 164, Norton Church, Durham, from NW.
From a drawing by C. C. Hodges in *The Reliquary*.

Saxon feature of acutely pointed gables in a very pronounced form. Within these gable lines the tower is pierced on all its four faces by triangular headed openings 7 ft. by 2 ft. giving on to spaces or chambers between the external pointed roofs and the flat roofs below. Higher up on each side of the gables there are small r. h. slits widely splayed internally, so that the tower was lighted and was evidently fully utilized

¹ From *The Reliquary*, 1894, with the kind permission of Mr C. C. Hodges, and of Mr George Allen who inherits the copyright from Messrs Bemrose.

in the way illustrated earlier in this chapter. Norton, Mr Hamilton Thompson considers,¹ makes a nearer approach than Stow to the central tower plan of the later mediaeval church, which is in its ground story all piers and arches, and is knit together with the parts that abut against it into a compact structural organism. It is to be noted that this later mediaeval arrangement is distinctly described in the account already quoted (p. 268) of the building of Ramsey abbey church about 970, where we are told of the tower 'in the centre of the cruciform structure' that it 'stood upon four pillars which were joined together pair and pair by arches thrown across from wing to wing to preserve the rigidity of the fabric,' but that this ideal was attained either at Stow or at Norton it would be rash to affirm. It is true that at both places the tower has emancipated itself from the nave, of which Dover and Breamore towers are still only parts, and exhibits its independence in its four quoins that stand out quite free, Figs. 163-4, beyond the narrower nave, transepts, and chancel. These quoins are however not piers but still only the corners of a four-walled structure and the superstructure rests on these four walls though the central part of each of them is a void. The other spaces come up to the tower but do not form with it a single whole, as when the tower bestriding the four spaces unites the effect of them. At Norton the fact that two of the original Saxon arches into these spaces were in later times enlarged seems to imply that the openings were regarded as wanting in amplitude, and this would show that the ideal of the mediaeval central tower had not been attained. Compare what is said about the openings at Dover (p. 354).

By assuming a very late date in the style for Norton we might exhibit the foregoing as a development, but the only marked Saxon details at Norton, the quoins of the N transept, mostly of big upright stones rudely cut, Fig. 164, seem earlier

¹ *Ground Plan of the English Parish Church*, Cambridge, 1913, p. 40.

than the transept quoins at Stow which though megalithic in feeling are cleanly wrought and have the stones set in the later fashion alternately N and S and E and W. This way of setting quoin stones is used occasionally quite early for it occurs at Escomb, Fig. 62, but it is not at all characteristic of Saxon practice till we come to the late 'Lincolnshire' W towers and other buildings illustrating the Saxo-Norman overlap. It carries therefore a late suggestion.

The subject of the Saxon tower in relation to church plans and of the Saxon transept is not yet exhausted, and this somewhat lengthy treatment is rendered necessary by that remarkable variety in Saxon architectural forms, which cannot be grouped according to types to the same extent as is possible with more systematic and consistent work such as that of the Normans. Central towers must be mentioned at Stanton Lacy, Shropshire, and Wootton Wawen, Warwick. The first named has a later central tower which may have been preceded by a Saxon one, a Saxon nave well preserved on N and W, with a later S aisle, S transept, and chancel. There is also a Saxon N transept much narrower than the nave. From the point of view of Saxon architecture generally the church is an interesting one. The proportions of nave and N transept are lofty in comparison with their width. The Saxon masonry is solidly put together with well-fitted polygonal stones, and the quoins are of fairly large stones set N and S and E and W without any l. and s. or megalithic character. The thickness of the S wall of the nave is 2 ft. 11 in. Recent removal of plastering from the walls of the N transept has brought to light the remains of a narrow doorway in its N wall now blocked, and there are marks on the top of this wall of a r. h. internally splayed light. The other windows have all been altered. There is no sign of a W doorway but one in the N wall is well preserved and is shown Fig. 162, below. The good construction and cutting of the voussoirs will be apparent. That the original work is Saxon is conclusively

shown in the detail above the arch of the doorway as well as on the exterior of all the nave and N transept walls. This detail is the pilaster strip, which is particularly well represented in the Shropshire monument. There is no plinth, but pilaster strips, 5 in. wide and of a relief greater than is usual, start from square stones that project from the wall near its foot. A horizontal string course square in section intersects them on the nave and transept walls, and on the W wall, where there are five strips, cuts them off. In the photograph one of these strips starts from above the arch of the N doorway having below it a row of pellets and a cross cut in relief. This position of the pilaster is conclusive proof that it is a decorative feature and not a buttress.

As no traces are left of a S transept of Saxon date it is possible that there never was one, and this suggestion carries us naturally on to the second building mentioned above, Wootton Wawen, where we find a central tower with indications of spaces opening from it on every side but N.

The church is a large and roomy one, with a chancel and extensive S chancel aisle and a S aisle flanking the nave, which has been reckoned Saxon but is undoubtedly Early Norman. For one thing the nave wall is 2 ft. 10 in. thick whereas the walls of the assuredly Saxon tower are 2 ft. 3 in. or 2 ft. 4 in. A Saxon nave wall would certainly not be thicker than the wall of the adjacent Saxon tower. The internally splayed light in the N nave wall looks quite Norman and so does the old N door of the nave. The tower quoins on the exterior show l. and s. work up to the belfry stage, which with the parts above it is of XV date. In the interior there is still a good deal of plastering though much was fortunately removed in 1906 exposing to view the l. and s. quoins on the E and W tower faces with the later walls built up against them, as shown in the plan, Fig. 165. The tower therefore stands in apparent independence, for the parts that abut against it are all post-Conquest, and with the amount of

internal plastering that still remains it is really impossible to say exactly what forms were exhibited by the rest of the original Saxon edifice. The openings however on the ground story of the tower show that the plan was what might be called a pseudo-central one, for on E, W, and S there are open archways with some enrichment, that must have admitted to chancel, nave, and S transept. The door to N seems on the other hand to have been always external for the jambs carry a flat stone lintel above which comes the arched head, the arrangement being very like what is seen in numerous Gloucestershire doorways, specimens of which are given

Fig. 182. Here at Wootton Wawen there is no filling in of the tympanum, but the external angle of the lintel is splayed off above as in Fig. 182. This feature as well as the curious technique at the springing of the arch has been noticed previously (p. 66 f.), Fig. 38.

Of the three open archways, which have their jambs constructed Escomb fashion, that to W is the highest, 14 ft. 3 in. to the soffit, with a span of 6 ft. 10 in. The voussoirs are not through-stones, and where the plaster allows a view they are of very irregular lengths. On the E face of the S jamb is a shallow rebate, perhaps not original, for a door, but the other openings are all cut straight through the walls. The openings to S and N are only 4 ft. 2 in. wide by a height respectively of 8 ft. 9 in. and 8 ft. 10 in. The E or chancel arch is 11 ft. 3 in. high by a width of 4 ft. 8 in. and most of the voussoirs are through-stones. To all the arches there are plain square imposts returned along the wall faces, and




FIG. 165, Plan of central portion at Wootton Wawen, Warwickshire.

on the inner sides of the arches except on the E side of the W arch there are plain square archivolt strips much after the pattern of those at Deerhurst, but no vertical strips on the jambs to carry them down to the ground. It is to be noted as peculiar for Saxon work that on the E side of the chancel arch there is a distinct keystone that is emphasized by being made to project $1\frac{1}{2}$ in. from the face. In the W face of the tower at an upper level there is a square headed doorway on the S side of the centre similar to the upper doorways in W towers and like them facing down the nave.

The tower of Wootton Wawen, about 14 ft. square internally, is thoroughly Saxon in appearance, and the simple massiveness of the openings with their well fitted stonework is decidedly impressive. The walling generally is a rubble of thin stones that are not set herring-bone fashion though this technique occurs in parts of the Norman nave. The l. and s. quoins show that the tower falls in Period C but it may very well be assigned to its middle decades.

A complete cruciform scheme with partially developed transepts but without a central tower meets us in the well preserved Saxon church at Worth, Sussex, embosomed in the ancient woodlands of St Leonard's Forest.

The general view, Fig. 166, taken from SE, and the plan, Fig. 167, will give an idea of the character of the edifice, the surroundings of which have inherited their wild sylvan beauty from the old forest of Andred that once covered this part of the country. The church is aisleless, cruciform and apsidal, but has no central tower, the tower seen in the view being a modern addition. The quoins are in l. and s. work and there is an abundant display of pilaster strips. A feature very pronounced in this building, that is fairly common elsewhere especially in towers,¹ is the horizontal string course which at a height of c. 15 ft. runs round the apsidal chancel as well as

¹ It occurs at Bradford-on-Avon, Repton, Kirkdale, Boarhunt, Stanton Lacy, Wroxeter, etc., and has left traces at Barholme, Lincolnshire.




FIG. 166, Worth Church, Sussex, from S.E.

(To face p. 362.)




FIG. 167, Plan of Worth Church, Sussex.

along the walls of the nave, though on the walls of the transepts, which are lower, it does not occur. The pilaster strips, that start from a plinth of two square orders, are bounded above by this string course where it appears, and above it comes the windows. In the nave these are of the double form, with the mid-wall shaft, illustrated in Fig. 14. There are original doorways of characteristic Saxon type of nearly 14 ft. in extreme height by a width of 3 ft. 8 in., facing each other N and S towards the W end of the nave. The N door is now blocked. The W door is an insertion.

The chancel arch at Worth is the finest of all that are extant. Its width is 14 ft. 1 in., its height 22 ft., and the rock-like massiveness of its huge ungainly imposts, and the large stones of the arch that take the whole thickness of the wall, are thoroughly Saxon. The arches into the transepts, in width 8 ft. 7 in. (S) and 8 ft. 8 in. (N) by about 15 ft. in height, are plainer but equally imposing in their solidity. As the internal width of the transepts is 14 ft. 9 in. and 14 ft. 10 in. respectively the arches are of full proportionate size. The transepts themselves, as will be seen in the view and in the plan, are much narrower and lower than the nave, and the general scheme is so far less advanced than those of Stow and Norton. The chancel, it must be noted, was rebuilt in our own time and has been as the plan shows disproportionately lengthened, though the chancel arch is original.

With regard to the date of Worth there is the same absence of definite indications as we have had to note in the case of Dover, Norton, Wing, and a host of other Saxon monuments. It is of course a Third Period church, and we may derive an indication that it should be placed late in the Period from the close resemblance of its double windows to those which are normal in the W towers of the 'Lincolnshire' type, that are so late as to be largely post-Conquest and partly Norman. There is of course no Norman element discernible anywhere at Worth, which is throughout characteristically Saxon.

The withdrawal of Hadstock, Essex, from any special connection with Cnut (p. 306) still leaves it one of the most attractive of our Anglo-Saxon monuments. The original work consists in a spacious nave, 57 ft. long, with a N door and a range of windows high up on each side of the nave, and with openings in the E part to two chapels or transepts. The one on the S has been rebuilt in an enlarged form but preserves the original jambs of the opening, while the walls of the N transept survive. The W tower is later and the chancel modern. The nave wall generally is about 2 ft. 6 in. thick, but at the transept openings it measures more than 3 ft., so that it has evidently been thickened for a tower. Evidence of this thickening can be seen outside above the transept roofs. The windows above mentioned are on a line 15 ft. from the ground in walls that rise to a height of about 23 ft., and have tall r. h. openings with some slope in the jambs. They are double splayed with the aperture in the middle of the thickness of the wall. The masonry as seen on the exterior is flint rubble with no regular coursing, and no herring-bone work save in a patch of made-up walling on the S side just above an inserted later S door.

The most characteristic features in the building are the N doorway, which has a fine old oak door (on which there is said to have been found nailed human skin) and the W jamb of the S transept arch which is given in Fig. 168. The detail here is of a remarkable kind. There is a moulded base of four orders, 3 ft. 3 in. high with quirked rolls, and angle shafts with enriched cubical caps of noteworthy form. These carry a plain impost slab¹ and above this is another slab with on its edge an enriched cresting. The caps, 9 in. broad, have their vertical faces cut away below at an angle, the lower part being chamfered off and brought down to an octagon which fits more or less aptly on to the circular shaft.

¹ This is slightly rounded on its upper and lower arris and the drawing needs correction here.




FIG. 168, W jamb of S transept opening at Hadstock, Essex.

The ornament on the caps and also on the crestring is described in the Monument Commission's *Report* as debased honey-suckle, and there is no doubt that the classical palmette is is




FIG. 169, Enriched crestring on top of jamb of N doorway, Hadstock.

its basis, but the leaves have degenerated into sunk triangles without any floral character except a general curvature of outline. Figs. 169 and 170 give details, the former is from the N doorway. This has preserved what has been lost in the case of the transept opening — the archivolt mouldings, and the arch has a plain soffit with a roll on the outer edge.

With no external aid to the dating of the work we have to take the evidence of the structure itself. The detail is 'advanced,' for there are angle shafts on the




FIG. 170, Detail of ornament on crestring at Hadstock.

jambes of the openings, and somewhat elaborately moulded plinths, with the remarkable crestring above the imposts. The plan conveys the same impression, for the two porticus are

thrown freely into the main area of the building with openings of practically the full width of the original transepts themselves, though the elaborate framing of the openings seems to suit the idea of the side chapel better than that of the fully developed transept. The fact that the walls are thickened for a tower conveys as will be suggested a suspicion of lateness (p. 373), and the earlier part of the Confessor's reign might be a near guess. It would there find its place in the evolution of the cruciform plan on which enough has now been said. If the question of continental affinities be raised, it may be affirmed with full confidence that there is nothing specially Norman about the work except perhaps the plinth. The cap and the cresting seem quite *sui generis*. Something like the former is figured by M. Enlart from the Museum at Issoudun near Tours,¹ and an XI shaft from St G  n  roux, Poitou, though the form of the cap is not the same, shows in the ornamentation a certain similarity.² It is not however necessary to assume that the masons at Hadstock were set to copy any special continental model. They were working in the spirit of their time, and using what they knew of the current practice. About the plinth a word may be said later on (p. 407).

Another important edifice, exhibiting an advanced scheme and details which are at the same time not characteristically Norman, is Great Paxton, near St Neots in Huntingdonshire, that has recently formed the subject of a careful study³ by Drs Louis Cobbett, F.R.C.S., and Cyril Fox, F.S.A., both of Cambridge. For the details, which are of much interest, the reader is referred to this fully illustrated paper, and all that is possible here is a very summary notice. In regard to the general scheme, the church is unique among Saxon or partly Saxon buildings in that its original scheme

¹ *Manuel*, 1st Ed., p. 373.

² Dehio, etc., Taf. 298, 6.

³ Published in the *Communications* of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, vol. xxv, 1924.

was that of a cruciform church with aisles to the nave. The nave has been cut short on W by the construction of a later tower but its side walls in the W parts were pierced with N and S arcades of round arches, once recessed on the nave side, and of a decided horseshoe form. On the W side of the wide N and S transeptal openings there are stretches of wall intended to abut the transeptal arches and ending in responds to the arches of the nave arcades. The jambs of these responds are constructed Escomb fashion, Fig. 171, and there are richly moulded imposts. The piers of the nave arcades are more advanced than anything we have had before us for they are formed of four circular shafts set at the angles of a square and divided on each face of the pier by small round shafts or angular projections. The bases are variously treated but are quite elaborate, the caps are of a bulbous form shown in Fig. 194, c, and will be noticed later on. It may be mentioned here that such




FIG. 171, Jamb of E respond S arcade, Great Paxton, Hunts.

caps (and similar bases) appear to be post-Conquest in date, but cannot easily be attached to any demonstrable tradition either Saxon or Norman. When we come to the E responds of the nave arcades, and to the jambs of the great transeptal and chancel arches, we find definite pre-Conquest features. The jambs of the responds have just been noticed, and we observe the

same Escomb fashion conspicuous in the masonry of the jambs of the great arches, though in these there has been a good deal of reconstruction. In their general aspect these jambs exhibit that massiveness and monumental dignity which has been claimed in these pages as the marked aesthetic quality of Saxon work at its best. In detail the jambs are faced on their soffits, or in the case of the more richly membered chancel arch are partly ringed, with rounded shafts alternating with smaller rounds or with angular projections as on the piers of the nave arcades. Drs Cobbett and Fox notice a certain similarity between the schemes of the chancel arch at Great Paxton and the chancel arch at Wittering, Fig. 186, though the former is far more elaborate. It must be remarked on the other side that the alternation of rounded and angular forms in the section of a moulding is in truth distinctively Norman. It occurs, e.g., in the S transept at Ely and in the N transept at Winchester, in a clearly Norman setting. We also find it used in two archaic-looking doorways to Sussex churches, both near the Brighton-London road, Wivelsfield and Bolney. These door heads are slightly recessed in two orders enriched with alternate rounds and angles, and were evidently the work of the same chisels, almost certainly wielded by Norman hands. A still more distinctive feature however at Great Paxton, and this time a Saxon one, is the square upright pilaster strip which we find on the jambs of the transept arches, as on so many undoubted Saxon tower and chancel arches that we have come to know. The strip is not continued round the archivolt.

There is no indication either by the thickening of the walls, or by any traces of a transverse arch across the nave W of the transeptal arches, that a central tower had been erected or designed, but such thickening is not obligatory, and as for the transverse arch, there is no trace of it at Hadstock where a tower is however distinctly indicated.

Worth has shown that a developed cruciform plan does not necessarily involve a tower, so that this question is of no great moment. The width of the transeptal arches at Great Paxton is nearly as great as that of the nave, and as we have seen in the foregoing pages this shows that the plan, independent of the nave aisles, is an advanced one.

Enough has been said to show that the location of the church in point of date is by no means easy, but we must certainly regard it as representing an advance towards normal Romanesque, not merely effected by copying Norman forms, but by using these with other forms drawn from the common European repertory so as to evolve something in advance of what had been done before. The process thus described will naturally have gone on after the Conquest, and in the case before us the bulbous caps, combined with the advanced plan of the whole church and of the piers of the nave arcades, incline the present writer to place the building in the latter part of XI though it still may be reckoned in the main a Saxon monument.

If the post-Conquest date of Great Paxton were only deduced from its ambitious character, the argument could be met and countered by an appeal to the imposing architectural scheme (p. 87) set on foot at St Augustine, Canterbury, by its Saxon Abbot Wulfric II, about 1050 A.D. Wulfric's design of a central church, of which we have unfortunately only the general plan,¹ was fully as bold and as 'advanced' as the scheme of Great Paxton, but we are ignorant of the forms and details with which the design must have been carried out. Had we a clear idea of these, the fact that the monument is datable and would no doubt represent the best ideals of its place and time would give it extraordinary value. As it is, we can signalize the work as the third or perhaps the

¹ This is figured and fully discussed by Sir W. St John Hope in a comprehensive paper in *Archæologia*, Vol. LXVI.

fourth,¹ and no doubt the greatest, of the Saxon churches on the central scheme made classic in the West by the Carolingian Aachen. This, we must remember, was preceded by Wilfrid's St Mary at Hexham (p. 181) and followed by Alfred's Athelney, while at a later date it inspired the Norman imitation at Hereford (p. 237). That the remembrance of Aachen underlay Wulfric's design may be inferred from the existence of eight great piers surrounding a circular central space and carrying or intended to carry an eight-sided or hemispherical dome. An aisle 6 ft. wide, no doubt with galleries above it, would have completed the scheme, which as noticed above (p. 87) was never fully carried out and was ruthlessly levelled to the ground by the first Norman Abbot. The central space, which had a diameter of about 25 ft., may have been intended as a mausoleum, and the whole structure had the sizable diameter of about 64 ft. in external measurement.

Looking back on the examples noticed in this chapter, what is the impression we receive? The character of the work as a whole bears out what has been repeated more than once in the foregoing pages that Saxon work is experimental and uneven, though for that very reason of an interest that is sometimes of a fascinating kind. Take the example of the tower. At a quite early date, that is a date early in the history of the tower as a whole, the Saxons could construct towers like Deerhurst, Barnack, or Earls Barton, self-contained structures of monumental dignity, but later on we see them encouraging towers of comparatively mean appear-

¹ At Abingdon in Berkshire, where was an interesting VII church noticed (p. 117), we are told that Æthelwold, who was made Abbot about 950 and became later on Bishop of Winchester, rebuilt or restored the early church that had been ruined by the Danes in what some authorities think was a 'central' form. The notice however in the *Abingdon Chronicle* is very difficult to understand. See Sir W. St John Hope's paper, p. 385, note 5.

ance to sprout up out of the walls of naves so that they only realize themselves as towers when they have risen above the eaves of the roof. As an indication where they are coming we sometimes find their quoins embedded in the nave walls or these walls thickened to bear the extra weight, but even here there is no system. The thickening of walls seems to be mostly late, e.g. Dunham Magna, South Elmham, Hooton Pagnell, Daglingworth, while the earlier Deerhurst and Repton—if there were actually towers here—and Breamore where a tower exists, show no such constructive preparation. Other existing towers, Monkwearmouth, Corbridge, Bardsey, are built on the thin walls normal in Saxon churches, and at the last named place the walls are so slight that it is a wonder the lofty tower upon them stands so firm.¹ One would have thought that the inexperienced early builders would have been the ones to take the precaution of thickening the walls below.

In the matter of planning, one has found that the ideas of transept and of side chapel or porticus were confused, and a space like that at Repton, on plan a transept, is camouflaged as a chapel screened off from the central area. The idea of appropriating such a space for a special purpose instead of throwing it freely open to the church at large seems indicated by the Saxon inscription over the narrow door of what might have been a transept at Breamore. Indeed the side chapel or porticus, beginning as we have seen so early, seems to have been rather a Saxon obsession, and its persistence when the transept might well have taken its place casts a light on the Hexham problem, and suggests that there may be more in what Eddius and Prior Richard say on the subject of separate oratories than some critics are disposed to believe.

This dallying with the elements of the cruciform plan, that only sorted themselves out clearly at the very end of the

¹ It is interesting to note that the walls of the upper story of this tower are made specially thin, no doubt to lessen their weight (p. 192).

period, is a little curious in view of the definite presentment in Early Christian architecture of both transept and cruciform plan. These were both Constantinian, for there was a




FIG. 172, Cruciform plan at S. Nazaro Grande, Milan. (No scale.)

scheme of this has survived in the of S. Nazaro Grande, Fig. 172. introduced in English work of VII, has been advanced here as a hypothesis, based largely on the existence of the transeptal plan at Peterborough (p. 168), and greatly strengthened by the historical certainty that such plans were used in VI in Gaul where Wilfrid must have come to know them (p. 168). A plan, partly conjectural, which is often reproduced, will illustrate the form, Fig. 173. That the plan of the Greek cross was used in England both in VII and in IX

transept at Old St Peters, and Constantine built at his new capital a sepulchral church in the form of a Greek cross dedicated to the Apostles. Though Constantine's original church has perished, an Apostles Church 'ad modum crucis,' perhaps a copy of it, was erected at Milan at the close of IV by St Ambrose, and the later Milanese structure




FIG. 173, Plan of early Church at St Denis, showing T form. (No scale.)

is a matter of assurance, for we have the descriptions of Wilfrid's 'central' church of St Mary at Hexham, and of

Alfred's similar building at Athelney. Hence it is clear that as early as Wilfrid's time both the transept and the Greek cross arrangement were known in England, and might have been expected to influence plans in the direction of a regular cruciform scheme so soon as in X Saxon architecture was inspired with a new life. The evolution of the scheme however was delayed because the transept was not realized in its true character, but was confused in a curious manner with a space of quite a different character.

As needs hardly to be said, we must not suppose that the Saxon builders were quite by themselves in exhibiting these characteristics. Saxon work is certainly to a considerable extent *sui generis*, but in the other architectural provinces of the West we can find analogies with what they do. The Romanesque styles indeed resulted from the crystallization of varied, often ambitious and sometimes futile, experiments, which were inspired by the Carolingian revival and went on as best they could even through the Viking period. The wide-spread influence of the Minster at Aachen (p. 237) shows that the post-Carolingian builders were pricked by the stimulus to achievement, and in all the great provinces, Lombardy, Burgundy, the Rhineland, Saxony, Normandy, and the rest, efforts were being made in the direction of what became the fully developed Romanesque of XII. The Normans, beginning late, showed from the first great capacity, and Bernay of about 1020 onwards is more architecturally promising than anything Anglo-Saxon builders ever put forward. Less important architectural provinces also had their own nascent Romanesque, and this applies to Ireland, where Irish 'Romanesque' is at first quite independent of Norman influence, and also to our own country, where native constructors felt the spirit of advance that was everywhere in the air and did their best with their own ideas and those

which came to them in more or less casual fashion from other regions.¹

The Austrasian connections, to which full justice has been done in preceding chapters, are obvious and of the first importance, but it is not pretended here that Saxon builders, say of early XI, were impervious to all suggestions from other parts. Ecclesiastics, who must have found their interest in architecture and the decorative arts a most healthful relief from too much churchmanship, travelled widely and had their eyes always open to new suggestions.² But if on the one hand in regard to X and early XI we must not be too pedantic in concentrating attention on central Europe, so, when we come to the actual epoch of the Conquest and consequent new settlement of England, though Norman influence is necessarily dominant, yet even in the time of the 'Saxo-Norman overlap' reminiscences of the older repertory of Austrasian forms may have survived in the minds of the Saxon craftsmen. This caution must be borne in mind as we pass on to the next chapter.

¹ It must always be remembered that in the immense profusion of forms which were being produced on every side resemblances may quite well be fortuitous, and 'those blessed words' 'derivation' and 'influence' need not always be at the tip of the architectural writer's pen.

² The Life of Bernward, Bishop of Hildesheim, of XI, is on this matter curiously illuminating.

CHAPTER XIII

THE SAXO-NORMAN OVERLAP

NOTICE WAS taken in a previous chapter (p. 227 f.) of the political and social connections established between Anglo-Saxon England and the Carolingian dominions. In VI Merovingian Gaul had taken the lead in the religion and culture of north-western Europe, but in VII there ensued a decline, and, though the religious connection between Britain and Gaul was maintained through the monasteries, and though Gallic craftsmen were summoned to aid in British architectural undertakings, Merovingian art, as de Lasteyrie has owned, was no longer capable of inspiring any new departure.¹ That accomplished writer regarded this however as symptomatic of a universal artistic decline and takes no note of the fact that in VII Celtic and Anglo-Saxon Britain for a time stepped into the place of Gaul as a centre of fruitful artistic activity. This same century saw the establishment, largely through the missionary energy of Boniface, of a religious connection between Britain and the continental regions north and east of the Rhine, and on the rise to power of the Austrasian or eastern section of the Franks under the house of Pippin, a relation in many ways effective and lasting for more than two centuries was set up between England and Carolingian Germany. The artistic effects of this connection, at first apparent in the domain of coinage, become conspicuous in the Anglo-Saxon architecture of X and XI.

The marriage in 1002 of Æthelred II with the Norman princess Emma, daughter of Duke Richard I, followed by

¹ *Architecture Religieuse*, 36 f.

the espousals later on in 1017 of Cnut with the same lady then a widow, was the beginning of another change in the relations of England with the continental powers, for though not at the moment effective it opened an era of Norman influence on England that found its ultimate outcome in the Conquest.

It must not be supposed that this new Norman influence would make itself immediately felt in the domain of the arts. That in the domain of the decorative arts the older German connection was fully maintained may be inferred from what has been summarized on (p. 229) from William of Poitiers' remarks on English decorative art at the time of the Conquest, which he evidently regards as different from the art he knew in the Duchy.

With regard to architecture, Anglo-Saxon fashions in building as exemplified in our Period C were by the time of Cnut pretty firmly established and so far as we can see remained in use unchanged through the prolific church-building era of Edward the Confessor. In the latter part of his long reign the philo-Norman king had actually introduced Norman artificers and Norman architectural forms into his kingdom or at any rate his capital, but there seems no evidence of incipient Normanization of our native style such as might have followed the introduction of the 'novum genus aedificationis'¹ as W. of Malmesbury calls it, in the conspicuous monument of Westminster Abbey church. Datable edifices of the last decade before the Conquest are rare. Harold built at Waltham Abbey in Essex a new church that was consecrated in 1060 and the present nave used to be claimed as part of his work. As this is purely Norman it might on this supposition be set down as a proof of an influence radiating from Westminster, but it needs hardly a glance to show that the present structure with its scalloped caps and chevrons belongs in all probability to the rebuilding

¹ W. Malm., *Gesta Regum*, ad ann. 1066.

under Henry II when Canons Regular were installed. As Rivoira remarks, of Harold's original church 'no trace is left.'¹ Kirkdale, Yorks., is a small church dated a few years before the Conquest, and there is somewhat advanced work in the W doorway, but it is not specially Norman or at any rate not Norman of the Duchy. So far as our present knowledge extends it may safely be said that up to the Conquest, Westminster apart, Norman elements in English art, constructive as well as decorative, are not only not conspicuous but are practically non-existent.

Between constructive and decorative art however the student of Saxon work has to mark a difference. The latter a Norman of the Conqueror's entourage might be constrained to praise, but he would be impressed differently by Saxon constructive work which was notably inferior to his own. Norman builders possessed some of the greatest of all architectural qualities, those of logic and consistency on the one side and on the other those of sublimity of mass and just apportionment of the smaller parts. The Saxons, capable as readers of these volumes will acknowledge of artistic work of the highest value in decorative carving and metal work, in the ornamentation of books, and in textiles, had not been gifted with the true architectural sense, and their work is restless and uncertain. It was however in many respects vigorous work, and this very restlessness led to a multiplication of forms that as we have seen attract and even rivet attention, though they may leave us at the end puzzled and unsatisfied.

Saxon and Norman architecture accordingly confront each other at the Conquest as two distinct organisms forced suddenly into intimate relations. The organism from overseas was far more advanced and better equipped and had at its back the prestige of a conquering and militant race; while the more modest apparatus of the native builders

¹ *Lombardic Architecture*, II, p. 216.

derived its strength from local traditions of some antiquity, was actually on the land and in working order, and was equipped for carrying out effectively on the old lines tasks of a well understood and simple kind. The outcome is what might have been expected. For work of a more ambitious and imposing order the Normans from the first occupied the field almost entirely, carrying out their own architectural ideas in a lordly and masterful fashion in monuments which in general scheme though not always in details are purely Norman, while on the other side in more homely undertakings the relations between the local and the exotic styles were rather different. Here the Normans seem to have taken over from Saxon architecture some of its characteristic features, and they reproduced them not only in their new island seats but also in later work in their own Duchy. Hence there came about what might almost be called a Saxonizing to an appreciable degree of the Norman forms and methods.

In the case of ecclesiastical monuments of the imposing kind, at the time of the Conquest the Saxon standard was certainly below the Norman, while after the Conquest the Norman standard of size and splendour itself rose rapidly, so that a cathedral or abbey church in which the Saxon builder of the time of Edward had risen fairly to the height of his task would not satisfy the ideals of the great Norman prelates who came over with or soon after William. Hence the major Saxon structures of X and XI had all to yield before long to larger and more ornate edifices, though we need not assume that the Normans had immediately condemned the former as intrinsically worthless. In the case of five of the most important cathedrals and abbeys, Canterbury, York, London, Gloucester, and Peterborough, and in that of Hereford also, the Saxon buildings were ruined by fire within a few years of the Conquest, and had necessarily to be rebuilt ; while Rochester, Wells, and St Frideswide's Oxford, were in a greatly dilapidated condition. At St Albans, at the end

of X, a Saxon abbot set on foot, though he did not carry out, a grand scheme of re-building, which points to the fact that the actual structure was recognized as small or faulty. At the important sites of Winchester, Ely, Durham, Worcester, Exeter, the re-building seems to have been deliberate. Worcester was reconstructed by its Saxon abbot Wulfstan, who pulled down the structures of his predecessor, Oswald, because they were not large enough, though he shed tears at an act which seemed to him to savour of sacrilege.¹ At Exeter, the first Norman bishop was thought to show a certain want of spirit and ambition, in that he was content with the ancient building of the abbey ascribed originally to Æthelstan and restored after the Danish wars by Cnut. The ancient seal, shown in Fig. 112, is believed to give a representation of the façade of this edifice. Such as it was however, the second Norman bishop, Warelwast, was not satisfied with it, and commenced in 1112 a new pile of which the well known transept towers are surviving portions. At Winchester and at Ely the Normans found on the sites buildings dating in all essentials from the great era of church restoration in the latter part of X. Such buildings might have stood for hundreds of years, but they were completely removed and new edifices constructed from the foundations by the first Norman bishop and abbot.

The facts here noted and the exclamation of Wulfstan of Worcester, 'Wretches that we are, we destroy the work of our saintly forebears, because we think in our pride that we can do better,' testify to the new ambitions which inspired greater architectural undertakings after the Conquest, but still allow us to credit the Saxon fanes with some nobility of proportions and workmanship. They had been in their day fully sufficient for their purpose. The Saxon cathedral at Durham, erected at the end of X, was, according to Symeon

¹ 'Nos, inquit, miseri Sanctorum opera destruimus ut nobis laudem comparemus!' W. of Malmes., *Gesta Pont.*, p. 283.

of Durham who had seen it, a stone church of fair appearance and magnitude (*honesto nec parvo opere*), but it was replaced a hundred years after by a Norman edifice larger and of grander show (*nobiliori satis et majori opere*).¹ The truth is that the age which opens with the settlement of the Normans in England was one of immense architectural activity. Such was the ambition of each generation of builders to surpass all that had been done before, that the Normans of the second period treated the earlier efforts of their countrymen with the same scant courtesy that was shown at the Conquest to the Saxon edifices. It is a striking fact that though Archbishop Lanfranc had erected from the foundations at Canterbury a new Metropolitan church that must, at least, have equalled the great Abbeys at Caen, yet, within a generation, the priors Ernulph and Conrad pulled down his choir and re-erected it on a scale of transcendently greater magnificence. The Norman Abbey church at Peterborough is more than double the size of the Saxon structure burnt down in 1116 the plan of which has been partially recovered, Fig. 72, but the 'glorious choir' of Conrad, at Canterbury, covered about four times the space of that occupied by the eastern part of the cathedral of Lanfranc.

In these greater churches there is little or no 'Saxo-Norman overlap.' The work is Norman, but at the same time in certain details of form and treatment the influence of older insular traditions may be discernible. The suggestion was made by E. A. Freeman² that the use of large round piers of columnar shape in Anglo-Norman greater architecture may be due to a traditional familiarity with this feature on the part of Saxon builders. It is true that columns on the small scale of the mid-wall shafts are common in Anglo-Saxon buildings, but this is not the case with columns used monumentally, as they were to be used in the nave of Gloucester cathedral. As a matter of fact, though there are

¹ *Hist. Dunelm. Eccl.*, Rolls Series, p. 81.

² *Arch. Journ.*, vii, 155.

notices of the employment of such columns in pre-Conquest buildings, actual surviving examples are singularly rare. Wilfrid used columns in VII in his churches at Hexham and Ripon,¹ and in both these cases, no doubt, he derived them from the Roman stations on the Wall and in Yorkshire. The church begun by Archbishop Ælbert at York in VIII was also 'solidis suffulta columnis.'² The mention of a column in the interior of the abbey church at Ramsey is evidence for X,³ but we hear nothing of columns in connection with the later work at Winchester of X, or at Canterbury.⁴ Of existing columns that once served as supports in Saxon structures the very circumscribed repertory is exhibited in Fig. 174, though to the Repton example F there must be added the four monolithic shafts in the crypt at that place (p. 315 f.). The Reculver columns C are noticed (p. 97). There is accordingly not much evidence that the column tradition was so firmly implanted in the Saxon mind as to influence the builders of the greater Anglo-Norman churches. On the other hand in the mighty single W tower at Ely it may well be claimed that a Saxon tradition survives. Saxon influence is however much more patent in the case of the less pretentious structures to which attention must now be turned.

The great majority of these are village or 'parish' churches though some are actually situated in towns. So far as size and architectural expression are concerned they are fairly comparable with contemporary Norman churches in the Duchy of the same type, and indeed to judge by surviving examples the Saxon village church of stone though architecturally plain was not far below the average size and preten-

¹ *Historians of the Church of York*, Rolls Series, no. 71/1, pp. 24, 33.

² *Historians*, etc., loc. cit., p. 394.

³ *Chron. Abb. Rames.*, Rolls Series, no. 83, p. 104.

⁴ See the 'Winchester' Volume of the Archaeological Institute, 1845, and *Canterbury Cathedral*, Lond., 1845, both by Professor Willis.

sion of a village church of later mediaeval or of modern times. The dimensions of the naves of about a score of the best preserved Saxon examples both large and small figured on a

former page, Fig. 2 (p. 21), will be found to give an average not very different from that of the naves of twenty Norman or early English examples chosen as fair specimens of their classes. On various pages of this volume are given sundry plans of Saxon churches of this type most of which would perhaps be pronounced below the later average of size, but on the other hand Dunham Magna (p. 347) Britford (p. 221) and St Martin, Canterbury (p. 80), are normal buildings of their order, measuring 43 ft., 44 ft., and 38 ft. 6 in. respectively, in length of nave, while Breamore (p. 349) 75 ft., Worth (p. 363) 59 ft., Wing (p. 321) 60 ft., Dover (p. 352) 95 ft., Bosham (p. 436) 56 ft., are decidedly large. The nave of Bitton, Gloucestershire, measures 95 ft., that of Tredington, Worcestershire, 56 ft. 6 in.




FIG. 174. Roman and Saxon columns.

- A. Roman monolithic shaft in Chollerton Church, Northumberland.
- B. Base of Roman column at St Pancras, Canterbury.
- C. Column from Reculver Church.
- D. Moulding below capital.
- E. Base.
- F. Column at Repton Church, Derbyshire.

Hence it follows that the average Saxon village church would appear in the eyes of the Norman holders of English manors commensurate with anything of the kind in their

own Duchy, and they often retained it in its normal form of W tower, aisleless nave, and square ended chancel. Often however they added to it by cutting arcades in the N or S wall or in both, and broadening it by aisles, which gave the basilican plan commoner we have seen in Normandy than in Saxon England (p. 233). Less frequently they gave to the chancel the apsidal termination which they were accustomed to in the greater churches of the Duchy, and which is rare in the Saxon churches of the later period. In cases which are fairly numerous where a fragment or fragments of Saxon work is preserved in a later Norman fabric, as at Kilpeck, Herefordshire ; Lusby, Lincolnshire ; Stanton-by-Bridge, Derbyshire, and many other places, there need not have been deliberate destruction as the Saxon building may have fallen into decay, and where they are now Norman churches in villages that have a presumably Saxon church mentioned in Domesday¹ a like fate may have befallen the earlier edifice as a whole. Without however speculating on what may or may not have happened under conditions of which we know so little, we may start with the fact that new Norman village churches were frequently built in the half century after the settlement of the conquerors in their fresh homes.

A remarkable feature in very many of these is the W tower. The W tower as a whole and in its details is the most conspicuous instance of what has been called the Saxo-Norman overlap. While this is a characteristic Saxon feature we have seen (p. 236) that it is in Normandy of the earlier Romanesque period a comparative rarity. Saxon W towers have already been discussed from the points of view of their probable derivation and their place in the general scheme of the church (p. 233 f.). What concern us now are questions of architectural form and constructive and decorative details, and

¹ It must always be remembered in connection with Domesday that the date of the Survey admits of the possibility of Norman churches having already replaced Saxon ones since the Conquest.

we shall see that the 'overlap' is evidenced by the facts that the Normans not only took over from the Saxons the tower itself in its characteristically Saxon position but were equally receptive in regard to its form and details.¹

With the general aspect of the pre-Conquest church tower we are already familiar (p. 20). W towers of this aspect exist in some abundance and are most frequently to be met with in the E parts of the country especially in Lincolnshire. Referring to the map at (p. 490) the three E Districts numbered III, VII and VIII supply about seventy examples while the rest of England furnishes hardly a score. Of the Saxon or Saxon churches which are dotted so thickly about Lincolnshire, a county which has more work of pre-Conquest character to show than any other, three fourths, or thirty out of about two-score examples, have W towers. So characteristic of Lincolnshire is the form that the name 'Lincolnshire bell-towers' is sometimes given to the whole group. Such towers cannot however be regarded as, in a strict sense, peculiar to the E counties, for specimens with some or all of the characteristic marks are common further north, especially in certain parts of Yorkshire and Northumberland, and occur sporadically in the other parts of the country, as at Wickham, Berks; Bosham and Sompting, Sussex; Titchfield, Hants; Morland, Westmorland.

Most of these W towers especially the Lincolnshire examples possess as their distinguishing feature the double belfry openings with mid-wall shafts, or where the belfry stage has been rebuilt the previous existence of such openings can be inferred from analogy. They are however commonly wanting in the more usual pre-Conquest indications such as l. and s. quoins, pilaster strips, and double splayed windows. There is no doubt at the same time that the possession by a

¹ What follows is specially on the particular class of Late Saxon towers known as 'Lincolnshire towers,' but for reasons of space some notices are introduced of features not strictly belonging to this group.

plain unbuttressed tower of this particular form of double belfry opening gives it a Saxon character, though on the other hand it is quite certain that some of the 'Lincolnshire' examples, which exhibit this distinguishing mark, have other details that betoken a later date, and are really post-Conquest. The truth is no doubt that this particular feature was so well established in this region before the Conquest that it continued in use after that epoch, and this is the most conspicuous though not the only illustration of the architectural phenomenon we are now considering—the survival of Saxon forms in the post-Conquest period.

It will be convenient to deal in the first place with such towers as possess none of the special Saxon features except the belfry openings—these towers number about fifty—and to form some idea of when and under what conditions they are likely to have been built, and whether the hands that wrought them were Saxon or Norman. The distinction between Saxon and Norman is of course racially quite clear, but as regards architectural knowledge and practice the case is different, for Saxon masons may in various degrees have become Normanized through intercourse with the new comers and through their recognition of the advantage of some of the fashions from overseas. Others of the Saxons may have clung in somewhat dour fashion to their own traditions and even have influenced in this direction the immigrants.

The subject of the W towers embraces many points of interest and we have to deal with (A) the general form, (B) the architectural treatment of the elevation, (C) the finish at the top of the towers, (D) the W door where it exists, (E) the smaller lights on the lower stages, (F) the tower arch, and finally (G) the belfry and its openings, with the caps and shafts in the mid-wall work.

(A) In their general form the majority of these towers are of a tall and slender shape, and this has come to be accepted





FIG. 175. W tower, St Peter-at-Gowts, Lincoln.

as typical. On the other hand most Norman towers are of comparatively broad proportions, and the Saxon type is often set against the Norman as the slender against the sturdy. It is well to note therefore that Norman examples both in the Duchy and in England are sometimes of elongated proportions. Between Caen and the sea there is a group of these, of which Lion-sur-mer, Luc-sur-mer, and Ver, are characteristic specimens, and these can be paralleled

in our own country, as for example at Weaverthorpe on the Yorkshire Wolds (p. 420).

The example shown in Fig. 175 is St Peter-at-Gowts, or St Peter-at-the-Watercourses, in the main street of Lincoln below the hill. It is a well known monument and offers the characteristics of the






FIG. 176, Tower of Clapham Church, near Bedford.

(To face p. 389.)

group in an epitome. The tower is tall and narrow with a width at base of 18 ft. 4 in., and rises from a boldly treated plinth that is not returned on the W wall of the church. There is no intentional batter in the walls which are in the main vertical, though as a fact they draw in a little in a curious fashion just under the string course, as can be seen in the drawing. The W doorway is of a rather advanced character in that it has a tympanum filled in with decorative stonework—a Norman feature (p. 394) while the jambs are constructed Escomb fashion. The tower quoins it will be noted have no Saxon character whereas the quoins of the adjacent nave are in l. and s. work, and this difference occurs elsewhere as at Bracebridge, Lincoln (p. 445). The double belfry openings however are of the type already referred to as giving to this group of structures their distinguishing character, while the tower arch, Fig. 151, and other features of the interior are of Saxon type. For date, see (p. 467).

The simplicity and rugged strength of these towers make them at times very imposing, and this effect is perhaps most marked in the case of a midland example the tower of Clapham church near Bedford, Fig. 176, which exhibits double splayed openings in the lower or original portion. It is about 85 ft. high and 21 ft. square, and as it was apparently wider than the Saxon nave, now wholly destroyed, it may have followed the type of Barton-on-Humber and Broughton (p. 289 f.). The upper story with recessed openings is later.

(B) A very limited amount of what may be termed architectural treatment is lavished on these austere simple unbuttressed walls. A plinth is sometimes present in one of the forms noticed on (p. 23) but *ex hypothesi* the special group under consideration is devoid of either pilaster strips or l. and s. quoins. Considering that these details were employed commonly in the later Saxon period when these towers must have been in building, and that, as we have just seen, they actually appear on the churches to which the towers are

attached, this is not a little curious. The only architectural feature that breaks the absolute plainness of the walls is the horizontal string course. Only one of these 'Lincolnshire' towers of the pure type, Great Hale near Sleaford, has no string course or other break in its perfectly plain outline¹ but in every other case in this group one at least is found, its most usual position being just beneath the belfry openings. A second is less common. Above each string course the tower sometimes contracts but this is not universal. St Andrew, Bywell, by the Tyne, and Monkwearmouth, Fig. 56, are examples to the contrary.

Enrichment by means of arcading is not unknown. Some of the East Anglian round towers, of uncertain date but often with Saxon features, display this in somewhat timid fashion, but the example par excellence is that of Branston near Lincoln, where arcading of quite advanced Romanesque character occurs on the lower stage of a tower that shows everywhere else only the normal features of the type. It is shown in Fig. 177, and is obviously Norman.

A very notable feature in the architectural treatment of these towers is the quoining. For the strictly 'Lincolnshire' group, this is *ex hypothesi* not in the Saxon l. and s. work, nor in the equally Saxon 'big stone work' like the example at St Mildred, Canterbury, shown in Fig. 5. The normal construction of the quoins in towers like St Peter-at-Gowts is that shown in Fig. 4 from Stow, Lincolnshire, worked with selected and carefully cut stones all about the same size parallelepiped shaped and set with the long sides running alternately N and S and E and W, a method that for brevity may be termed 'Stow fashion.' There is nothing special in itself about this technique, which is used by Norman and later mediaeval builders, but in the transition period with which we are now concerned there is a distinction between work

¹ Deerhurst; and St Michael, Oxford, are also quite plain, but they do not belong strictly to this group as they have distinct pre-Conquest detail.





FIG. 177, Arcading at base of W tower, Branston, Lincolnshire.

(To face p. 390.)



of the kind to which the specially large size of the stones gives a certain megalithic character and that where the stones are of quite ordinary dimensions, and have nothing about them to catch the eye. The quoin stones of the transept at Stow, Fig. 4, are of the former sort, and other characteristic specimens (though not from towers), ruder in execution, are from Lusby, Lincolnshire, Fig. 178, and Duntisbourne Rous near Cirencester, Fig. 179. The latter is a small Norman church with a crypt-like chamber under the chancel conditioned by the fall of the ground. There is nothing Saxon about it save this big stone quoining which is clearly an 'overlap.' The Lincolnshire Lusby, in the midst of the great 'by' district centering in Spilsby, possesses distinctly Saxon features embedded in later work. Conspicuous among these is the somewhat elaborate plinth that runs from the NE corner of the nave as shown in Fig. 178 down the N wall till it is cut away nearer the W end by an inserted Norman N doorway, thus showing its priority to the last named feature. The corresponding S door of the nave has Saxon remains. The whole NE quoin is most characteristic.

(C) With regard to the finish at the top of the towers our evidence is but scanty, and there is no reason to suppose that any one scheme was in universal use. Only one Saxon tower has preserved its ancient finish, and this is Sompting




FIG. 178, NE quoin of nave, Lusby, Lincolnshire; Saxon work.

in Sussex where a form of cap common in Germany and called the German Helm is employed. The sketch, Fig. 180 (A), will explain the form better than a description. One of the other towers has a distinct indication that this finish





FIG. 179, quoin at Norman church of Duntisbourne Rous, Gloucestershire.


was once applied to it. This is St Benet, Cambridge, which has Saxon features in the form of l. and s. quoins up to the very summit of the present structure, and we should at first sight conjecture that it had in Saxon days what it possesses now, a flat top like that of some Early Norman towers in the Duchy such as Lion-sur-mer to the north of Caen. If we examine

the view of the upper part of it however in Fig. 180 (B) the central example on the plate, we see that a pilaster strip starting high up from a corbel ascends in the centre of each face, and a comparison with Sompting suggests that this strip once ran up to the point of a gable, and that the finish was a German Helm. For further details, see (p. 430 f.).


There are some indications at Corbridge that the tower had its E and W walls surmounted by gables carrying between them a roof of saddle shape. A pyramidal cap of stone is the finish of many early towers, as of the Irish round towers and of that at Ver in Normandy, and a very interesting example survives in our own country in the square Norman tower of the oratory on Priestholm, or Puffin Island, just at the south-eastern extremity of Anglesea, Fig. 180 (C). This is a form of vaulting, the stones being placed in horizontal layers but



A, Sompington, Sussex.



B, St Benet, Cambridge.



C, Priesttholm (Puffin Island), Anglesca.

FIG. 180, Upper parts of two Saxon towers and one of Norman date.

in encorbellment, and requires nice construction to which our Saxon builders, inferior in this respect to the Irish, were probably not equal, so that it is doubtful if this should be included among possible terminations to Saxon towers.

(D) A W door of entrance occurs or has left its traces in about half the towers. The doorways here are of different types and exhibit some very characteristic details, some of the pure Saxon kind such as those we found at Earls Barton, Fig. 123, and others of an 'advanced' nature, so that the doorway uses or at any rate prefigures normal Romanesque motives. It is with these last that we are here specially concerned as germane to the whole subject of this chapter, and dealing from this point of view with the W doorways of

towers it will be quite reasonable to include in the survey arched openings in other positions which exhibit similar characteristics.

It was noticed of the W doorway at St Peter-at-Gowts that it had an enriched tympanum filling, and that this was a Norman feature. There is in reality nothing in our older churches that is so definitely Norman as the sculptured tympanum, a subject to which Mr C. E. Keyser has done full justice. The sculptured tympana in the W doorways at the otherwise Saxon-looking




FIG. 181, Blocked doorways with tympana filled in.

A, Miserden, Gloucestershire (Saxon).
B, Hatfield, Herefordshire (Norman).

Stottesdon, Salop, and Ault Hucknall, Derbyshire, give away both buildings as Early Norman. The older Saxon doorways, as we have seen all along, if not square headed as at Escomb,

were finished with an open round arch. Now in this latest period we find doorways that have jambs of Saxon character but filled-in tympana, while others have open heads but Norman rather than Saxon character in their masonry. Where the filling is decorative as at B in Fig. 181 a blocked doorway from St Leonard, Hatfield, Herefordshire, the work is Norman, but a doorway like A from Miserden, Gloucestershire, with its




FIG. 182, Doorways, A, Ampney-Crucis, and B, Winstone, Gloucestershire.

'stepped' imposts (p. 280), need not be taken out of the Saxon list because the tympanum is filled in with plain masonry. This last example is from one of a number of Cotswold churches which possess doorways, generally to N of the nave, with distinct Saxon technique in the jambs and with flat lintels with a chamfer on the upper edge above which the tympanum is filled in with simple stonework. Two characteristic examples are given in Fig. 182. It would be difficult to place these were it not that a doorway of similar

character but without the filling occurs on the N face of the tower at Wootton Wawen, Warwickshire, that is as we have seen entirely and unmistakably Saxon, (p. 360 f.) and Fig. 38. The form of the doorways is certainly pre-Conquest but the filling has a Norman suggestion.

In contrast with the above there may be noticed a group




FIG. 183, W doorway of tower, Clee, Lincolnshire.

of W doorways in the actual Lincolnshire towers, without Saxon specialities and without Norman detail, but of a massive simplicity that we have come to associate with the best class of Saxon work. Fig. 183 shows a good example from Clee near Grimsby. It is a very dignified piece of work, and the fact that as we shall see later on there are post-Conquest caps in the mid-wall work above may be urged as a reason for postulating a Norman origin. It should be explained

that the plain imposts project about 2 or 3 in. from the wall face and the outer order or hood mould is flush with them. The middle order is recessed 2 in. behind this, and the inner order which is flush with the wall face is about $\frac{1}{2}$ in. lower.

The word 'recessed' which has just been used suggests the inquiry how far the process known as recessing was




FIG. 184, Saxon doorways with recessed jambs and angle shafts.

A, Kirk Hammerton ; B, Kirkdale, both Yorkshire.

used by the Saxons. It is of course characteristically Norman, yet in this later period, when the Saxon master-builders were feeling their way towards what became normal Romanesque forms, they use it without any necessary dependence on any special Norman models. With recessing may be taken the use of angle shafts, uncommon but still demonstrably Saxon though always of advanced date, and also the employment of soffit shafts and soffit rolls about which more may be said.

The original Saxon chancel arch at Kirk Hammerton, Yorks., is recessed with two square orders, and so is the fine tower arch at St Mary Bishophill Junr., York, though this is not so assuredly Saxon. The tower, formerly chancel, arch at Broughton, Lincs., is recessed but this work as we have seen has distinctively Norman features. There are also here angle shafts, Fig. 130, but in spite of the existence of a pronounced Norman influence (p. 414) the angle shaft is used without any sense of its true architectural function, for there is nothing above it for it to carry, and the scheme of the pier below the impost has no organic connection with that of the archivolt. There is recessing also in the two examples shown in Fig. 184 for A is from the assured Saxon church of Kirk Hammerton and B from Kirkdale attested as pre-Conquest by the inscription on the sundial, Vol. 1, p. 357. The recessing is of the same rather timid kind that has just been noted at Clee, and the shafts have the same purposeless appearance as those at Broughton. The caps




FIG. 184 bis, from S door to nave, Stopham Church, Sussex.

will be noticed later on. As a contrast to the examples just quoted, Fig. 184 bis, from Stopham Church, Sussex, which has been diagnosed as Saxon, gives us a far more grammatical treatment of the relation between pier and archivolt, and might be regarded as Norman.

Referring back to the arch at Broughton, Figs. 130, 131, we note the soffit shaft which comes under the inner order but does not support it nor have anything above its capital. What should be here is a soffit roll on which a word must be said. This feature occurs in several Late Saxon churches and some that illustrate the Saxo-Norman overlap. It is in evidence at St Botolph, Sussex, the date of which cannot well be fixed with certainty,

and is prominent at Sompting, Fig. 201, where again there is a question about the actual date. There is a very conspicuous example in the E tower arch at Langford, Oxon, shown Fig. 194, *b*, on its E face. The W or more important face of the same arch has an angle shaft carrying a roll round the archivolt, and this leads the way to a fairly common Late Saxon treatment of the jamb where there is a half-round shaft on each face of the jamb with a soffit shaft between, all three carrying archivolt rolls. This is a form found at Clayton, Sussex, which appears to be a genuine Saxon church, though it is in a region where dating is specially difficult. The plan of the jamb is given in Fig. 185, and it will be seen that there is no real recessing and the shafts in the faces are not true angle shafts. There are here no bases or capitals. In the undoubted and very characteristic Saxon church of Wittering, Northamptonshire, there is an advance on this, and this difference is in favour of a Saxon date for Clayton. Wittering chancel arch is shown in Fig. 186 with its plan. The thoroughly Saxon impost will be referred to presently. It will be seen that the face shafts are like those at Clayton not angle shafts, but they have a timid suggestion of bases and capitals which really seem to look on to Langford, Fig. 194, *b*. The upright member of the strip-work round the opening is similarly treated. There are the three archivolt rolls above.

An advance on Wittering is seen in the chancel arch at Bosham, Sussex, the lower part of the N jamb of which is shown in Fig. 187. There is a soffit shaft with a nondescript base and two normal angle shafts, all bedded on two huge slabs, a square one measuring 4 ft. E to W and 9 in. high, and another above it in the form of a circular disc 3 ft. 6 in. in diameter by 9 in. in height. These slabs are commonly attributed to the Romans, but it is not easy to see what part




FIG. 185, Plan of jamb of chancel arch, Clayton, Sussex.

of a Roman building they can ever have formed. The





FIG. 186, View and plan of N jamb of chancel arch, Wittering, Northants. Scale of plan $\frac{1}{4}$ in. to 1 ft.

truth is that they bear no resemblance to known classical features, while they are on the other hand characteristically Saxon. It is quite Saxon also to find these same slabs reversed in position employed up above as imposts, with the bases also reversed to serve as capitals for the shafts. These last carry their proper archivolt rolls in grammatical fashion. A similar arrangement of shafts and rolls but with normal caps and bases to the shafts is met with in the tower arch at Carlton-in-Lindrick, Notts, where there was the Saxon mid-wall work in the original belfry openings. The caps have an ornamentation that may be derived from upright leaves of Norman suggestion. It is noteworthy to find almost an exact replica of the archivolt treatment at Bosham in the chancel arch of the neighbouring church of Stoughton (p. 419) where the shafts have unmistakably Norman Ionic capitals

It would be a natural explanation of these facts to say

that Norman influence was making itself felt in all this, and that the trained architects of the Duchy were schooling the comparatively barbarous Saxons. The difficulty in accepting this literally resides in the fact that the soffit roll is really not a Norman feature. It is true that it is much in evidence at Bernay, of early X, practically the first of the great Norman




FIG. 187, Lower part of N jamb of chancel arch, Bosham, Sussex.

Romanesque churches, but after that it ceases to be in use, and Ruprich-Robert¹ says about Bernay that 'les gros tores des archivoltés de la nef et du chœur sont exceptionnels en Normandie.' Early Norman arches are very commonly recessed in two square orders, and of course properly related to the shafts below, as at Cerisy-la-Forêt, etc., but the half-round soffit shaft 'fait défaut.'

¹ *L'Architecture Normande*, I, 60.

Much more rarely than on W do we find doorways on the lateral faces of Saxon towers, but they occur in porch-towers as at Bardsey, and are also used in exceptional towers to give communication with lateral adjuncts. When a tower forms the body of a church the door of entrance will generally be at the side.

(E) The smaller lights in the lower stages of the 'Lincolnshire' towers are *ex hypothesi* not of the double splayed Saxon form but are normally internally splayed loops with narrow




FIG. 188, Keyhole loop, W face of tower, Clee, Lincolnshire. Height, 2 ft. 8 in.

outside apertures. One particular form of aperture has received the name of 'keyhole' from its shape shown in Fig. 188, and a word has been said about it on a previous page (p. 35). Small openings are sometimes cut straight through the thickness of the wall after the fashion of the doorways. There are examples in the towers of Deerhurst, Barnack, Burnham Deepdale, Norfolk, etc.

(F) On entering a church with a W tower our attention is immediately directed to the arch opening from its ground story into the body of the church. This is generally, but by no means always, of lofty proportions and seems to have been practically always in old times open and not closed by a door. The exceptional arrangement at Leathley, near Otley, Yorkshire, has been already noticed (p. 200), and there is discussed in that place the question whether these early towers were used like the

Irish round towers for purposes of defence. It was seen that there is not the smallest actual indication of such a use. It may be worth noting that in one single instance the tower arch is not cut straight through the wall but is splayed somewhat towards the church, a peculiarity to be noticed also in the W opening to the crypt at Hexham, Fig. 68. The tower is that of Warden on the N Tyne near Hexham and is exceptional in other respects also, but it certainly belongs to the pre-Conquest period (p. 484).

One exceptional tower arch, that at Corbridge, has already received attention. Many fine simply turned arches devoid of enrichment occur in the 'Lincolnshire' towers and look almost Roman in their unpretending dignity. Clee possesses a fine one measuring 16 ft. 8 in. in height by a width of 6 ft. 9 in., which matches in character the western door already illustrated. St Peter-at-Gowts exhibits a still more imposing portal of a height of at least 20 ft. to the crown. Many of the round towers of E Anglia, some of which may be of pre-Conquest date, are remarkable for their very lofty tower arches. There is a good example at Forn-cett St Peter, Norfolk. Apart from Barnack and St Benet, Cambridge—towers we are not specially dealing with—no tower arch is finer than that at St Mary Bishophill Junr., York. The tower here is one of the 'Lincolnshire' type with mid-wall work in the four belfry openings;¹ with something Saxonian about the big stones of the quoins which have no l. and s. character, but with a large amount of herring-bone work in the tower walls, which we have seen to be a Norman feature. The tower arch opens to the nave with an aperture of 10 ft. span and a height of nearly 16 ft. Alike on its E and its W face the arch is recessed, but the two

¹ These openings, which are surrounded with strip-work, were originally of exceptional size, and have been reduced in height by being built up for some feet above the sill. They are thoroughly Saxon, and their combination with the Norman feature of herring-boning is significant of an 'overlap.'

orders of the jambs and the archivolt, the archivolt strip that surrounds the extrados of the arch on both faces, and the imposts in two superimposed orders, are all absolutely plain and square in section. The treatment is much the same as at Kirk Hammerton, Yorks., and at Wootton Wawen (p. 360), and there are no pilaster strips in connection with the archivolt strips above. The stones of the jambs at St Mary Bishophill Junr. are through-stones in which the recessing is cut, but the voussoirs which are properly shaped and fitted are not through-stones—again a similarity with Wootton Wawen. The construction of archivolts as well as jambs with through-stones is fairly common but an arch constructed with voussoirs that are not through-stones may still belong to the pre-Norman epoch. An illustration may be drawn from a characteristic piece of Anglian work that has only recently been brought to light. Whittingham church near Alnwick, Northumberland, is noted as giving us the most northerly specimen of pure Anglo-Saxon architecture in Britain. Its W tower, of which the upper part that probably had double belfry openings has been modernized, has been long famous in the North for its l. and s. quoins but the tower arch internally was concealed. A few years ago it was opened out with the result shown in Fig. 189, from a drawing




FIG. 190, Enriched impost on jamb of tower arch, Whittingham, Northumberland.


kindly made and presented by Mr John Turnbull Dixon of Rothbury. It is a noble opening, 17 ft. 10 in. in total height by a width of 7 ft. 4½ in., with a rugged Anglian grandeur, the jambs constructed in a rude Escomb technique, but the old

voussoirs not through-stones (the uppermost voussoirs are modern). The moulded plinth at the foot of the jamb will be



Fig. 189, Tower arch at Whittingham, Northumberland.

(To face p. 404.)



noticed, and attention may also be called to the impost, shown Fig. 190, on the soffit of which, not on the returns, there is a curious enrichment with egg-shaped, or at least oval, pellets.

The subject of the plain and the enriched impost must here have a word and will lead on to the theme of the carved




FIG. 191, Some enriched imposts. (Scale about $\frac{1}{10}$ of nature.)

- A, A'. Barholme, Lincolnshire, jamb of S door of nave.
- B. Barnack, Northants, tower arch. (See Fig. 120.)
- C. Coln Rogers, Gloucestershire, chancel arch.
- D. Howe, Norfolk, tower arch.
- E. Deerhurst Chapel, chancel arch.
- F. Repton, Derbyshire, pier of vault in crypt.
- G. Pattishall, Northants, chancel arch.
- H. Corhampton, Hants, N door of nave.
- J. Daglingworth, Gloucestershire, S door of nave.

capital which meets us in the mid-wall work of the belfry stage of the towers. A few examples are given in Fig. 191.

The plain square impost is characteristically Saxon and is imposing in its mass and simple dignity. Besides those already mentioned many examples could be quoted. A

modification is introduced when the face of the impost-block slopes as at Market Overton, Fig. 9, and Wittering, Fig. 186. In this last example the front part of the impost is formed of two superimposed slabs each measuring 4 ft. from W to E by a depth N to S of 2 ft. 6 in. and a thickness of about 9 in. The normal form however of the unadorned impost is the chamfered form of which there are innumerable specimens. The hollow chamfer is found in settings that attest its Saxon character, as in the doorway between tower and nave in the almost entirely Saxon church of Billingham, Durham, or the double opening in the E tower wall at Deerhurst, Fig. 86, but a doubt about the quirked chamfer was expressed on (p. 31), and the step-pattern form of impost was figured and discussed on (p. 281). In Fig. 191, the impost from Corhampton, H, is on a small scale like the grand impost of the well known tower arch at St Benet, Cambridge, so often figured, where the archivolt mouldings start from above the bodies of couchant lions, very crudely rendered. B is the profile of the remarkable impost of the tower arch of Barnack (p. 279). E from Deerhurst Chapel is timidly profiled but gives us the quirk, though not the quirked chamfer of Norman imposts. C is from the complete Saxon church of Coln Rogers, Gloucestershire and the jambs and arch which it divides are constructed with through-stones. It is quirked like the last example.

The most elaborate of the specimens here shown occurs in the narrow doorway in the S wall of the nave at Barholme, Lincolnshire. There is a moulded plinth of several orders and an impost equally developed so that the majority of architectural experts would probably say that it must all be Early Norman. The pre-Conquest date of the doorway and part of the S wall of the nave is however practically assured by the fact that the latter carries a horizontal Saxon string course, and the plinth is continued E below it for 18 ft., while above the doorway there rises a portion of a Saxon pilaster

strip, occupying the same position just above the crown of the arch that pilaster strips occupy in the undoubtedly Saxon examples at Stanton Lacy (p. 359), and also at Corhampton, Hants. The plinth may be compared with that at Hadstock, Fig. 168, an advanced example that is not specially Norman, any more than is Barholme. What is meant is that, though Norman plinths may be found with a general resemblance, yet other Romanesque districts would probably supply equally near prototypes.¹ In one or two instances Roman worked stones are found used for the imposts of tower arches. Such is the case at Warden, by the Tyne, Northumberland, and likewise at Alkborough in the N of Lincolnshire, where the arch jambs have also Roman moulded stones for a base.

(G) The belfry stage is the most important part of the whole tower, for here are exhibited the features which give this type of monument its pre-Conquest stamp. The general character of the double belfry opening and its derivation through Germany from Italy has already been made clear (p. 247 f.), and attention will be confined here to the remarkable details we find in the work, especially in the case of the caps, where a strong Norman infusion makes itself apparent.

The mid-wall shafts in towers of this type are not balusters, though a reminiscence of the baluster form may be seen sometimes in a pronounced entasis like that of the shaft at Worth, Fig. 14. One of the shafts at Glentworth, Lincs., has a bellying outline, and other examples could be named, but normally the shafts are plain and straight sided, without tapering, in section circular or octagonal, or sometimes oblong—that is measuring more in the direction of the thickness of the wall, a peculiarity agreeing with a feature of some of the caps to be afterwards noted. These shafts are sometimes enriched, as at Glentworth, Lincs.; Appleton-le-Street, Yorkshire, and other places, while at Beechamwell, Norfolk, the

¹ The Aurelius-Kirche at Hirsau, near Stuttgart, of XI, Dehio, Taf. 230, furnishes an instance.

carved shaft of an old churchyard cross has been used. It is noteworthy that, while the older tower openings at Barton-on-Humber on the lower stories have the balusters, the uppermost story, subsequent to the rest, shows the later straight-sided shaft. In most cases the shafts are provided with capitals, and less frequently with bases, with which feature time has dealt more hardly than with the more sheltered caps. These last have of course suffered considerably through weathering and have in many cases been replaced by copies. In what follows dependence has been placed on those examples that seem to bear a decided impress of antiquity. There is every appearance that these caps were as a rule made for the places they occupy, and in a large number of instances they share with the enriched shafts the peculiarity that they are only decorated on the outer face and part of the sides, so that we can imagine them being actually carved at the work. M. de Lasteyrie believes that Romanesque capitals were as a rule carved after being actually placed in position,¹ but this would be awkward with caps in belfry openings. A selection of characteristic examples is given in Fig. 192, and for the sake of comparison a few caps from other positions in presumably Saxon churches have been added in Figs. 193, 194, while with these examples should be associated the Repton cap already represented in Fig. 144, A, and the cap at Hadstock from Fig. 168. The caps exhibit no trace of the figure or animal work so abundant on the carved cross shafts and sepulchral stones, and the foliage is of the most debased kind, the last belated offshoot from the Corinthian tradition that had inspired so much rude but florid carving in the Carolingian and earlier periods. They are either purely tectonic,² or tectonic with only slight surface enrich-

¹ *Architecture Religieuse*, p. 605.

² The useful word 'tectonic' is not so commonly used in French and English as in German. It is applied to shapes produced by the tool which remain purely geometric without any representation of natural forms.

ment, and are modifications of the cube, the sphere, or the cylinder, or else they are volute caps ultimately derived from the Ionic.

We have seen already (p. 252 f.) that the tectonic cap, the perfected and typical form of which is the cubical, belongs in the early mediaeval period to the Rhineland and Saxony as well as to Italy, though it appears also in early forms in E France, while the volute cap is a speciality of Normandy.




FIG. 193, Tectonic capitals of cubical origin.

In Fig. 192 both the tectonic and the volute caps are fully represented, while the examples in Fig. 193 are tectonic and derived from the cube, whereas those in Fig. 194 are generated by the cylinder and the sphere.

Fig. 192 no. 1, from St Mary-le-Wigford, Lincoln, is a case where we may be dealing with a reproduction of an earlier cap, but the form is thoroughly typical and occurs in other examples of the period such as those shown in Fig. 193, and the two previously figured in Fig. 184, with which it

must be taken in connection. There is one of the same kind also in the double window in the E wall at Wing, Fig. 108. They all represent somewhat crude methods of getting down from the square of the top of the cap to the octagon or the circle of the summit of the shaft. The crudest attempt is that at Repton, Fig. 144, A, for the carver has been satisfied here with getting down from a larger square to a smaller one the corners of which of course overhang in an awkward fashion the circular shaft. In the next stage an octagon is reached, and this is easily arrived at by not only sloping in the sides of the square but also chamfering off the corners of it as in Fig. 192, no. 1, while the sloping sides and the chamfers may be made hollow as is the case with no. 4 in Fig. 193 from Boothby Pagnal, Lincolnshire. Two caps in the undercroft of the dormitory at Westminster, probably from the Early Norman Dorter, are somewhat similar. Such a plan at the base will however not properly fit the top of a cylindrical shaft, like that at Broughton-by-Brigg, Lincolnshire, no. 2 in Fig. 193, or the shaft in no. 5. This example comes from the great pre-Conquest abbey church at Jumièges in Normandy and has been chosen to show that in the Duchy as well as in other parts of Europe attempts were being made in the direction of the cubical capital, though the form was not one that the Norman builders specially favoured. Here are hollow chamfers at the corners of a parallelepiped mass but the base of it is not round in plan. The two other examples in Fig. 193, nos. 1 and 3, from Wharram-le-Street, Yorks, and Marton, Lincolnshire, respectively, show how the adjustment was secured by an unworkmanlike rounding off of the lower part of the mass. In no. 1 the flat surfaces of the sides of the original cube are preserved in the shape of triangular panels which as they descend stand out from the rounded surface about them to a vertical depth at the points of about $\frac{3}{8}$ in. No. 3 is from the chancel arch of Marton, Lincs., near where the old Roman road from

Lincoln to Doncaster after passing Stow crosses the Trent, and shows the cube starting to become an inverted pyramid but rounded off as it descends so as to end as an inverted cone. The curious surface enrichment here may be an attempt to conceal the very helpless and unworkmanlike form of the cap. The ovals may be compared with those on the Whittingham impost, Fig. 190.

The change from no. I, Fig. 192, with its various kindred shapes to no. II is extraordinary for in the latter we find the problem solved in the simple and effective manner noticed on an earlier page (p. 253). This is from Clee, Lincolnshire, the church that has furnished a fine W doorway and tower arch as well as a keyhole opening (p. 396 f.). It is a regular cubical cap though not quite of the normal form for there is too much of the square upper part in proportion to the lower, and no. III, from Rothwell, Lincs., shows an advance in that the sphere is 'mitred,' that is, subdivided into four cushion-like forms separated by sinkings like those on a melon-shaped bead. With nos. IV, V and VI we come to modifications which can be claimed as specially English. Here the vertical faces of the cube, instead of being as in no. III single semicircles or stilted semicircles as in no. II, are subdivided in no. IV into two and in no. V into three semicircles, by which the amount of vertical surface is much reduced in depth so that the melon-shaped spherical part below gains in importance. Thus is formed the so-called 'scalloped cap' first perfected in England before the end of XI and used afterwards in great abundance in the churches of Normandy.¹ Nos. V and VI are from the tower of Bracebridge, just outside Lincoln (p. 445), which has no Saxon features save the double belfry openings, while the nave of the church has l. and s. quoins, but no. IV comes from Branston near Lincoln the W tower of which is enriched in its lower

¹ See on this subject a paper on 'Le Chapiteau à Godrons en Angleterre' by Mr John Bilson, F.R.I.B.A., Caen, 1910.

part in the remarkable fashion shown in Fig. 177. Mr Micklethwaite thought at one time that this might be an insertion but it is best to take it as an original part of the work and it is obvious that it is of great chronological significance. The caps of the small colonnettes of the blind arcading are either scalloped or cushion and the bases are like cushion capitals upside down. The archivolt mouldings of the doorway are quite advanced and the tympanum is filled in with decorative stonework. The angle shafts of the jambs are surmounted by volute capitals, and this fact is significant in connection with the other capitals in Fig. 192.

All of these with the exception of nos. xii and xiv are volute capitals, and nos. xii and xiv are in the same set as nos. xiii and xv that resemble them but are also furnished with volutes. Besides the volutes, no. ix, from Scartho near Grimsby, has round the lower part a ring of objects that are undoubtedly upright leaves turned over outwards at the top, and we may assume that the cigar-shaped objects round nos. xii to xv are to be explained in the same way, while the objects round the lower part of no. x are doubtless also leaves. The importance of the volute is due to the fact that it is the favourite Early Norman enrichment for the capitals. The volute however, it may be noted, as used in these belfries, is only a means of decorating a shape arrived at in the process of construction. The construction in this case is not the same as in that of the normal cubical cap. In the latter, the diameter of the hemisphere that interpenetrates with the cube is equal to the *diagonal* (in plan) of the cube. In the caps now before us (see nos. vii and viii) the lower part of the cube is worked into the form of a hemisphere of a diameter equal only to the *side* of the cube. The smaller hemisphere is carried round in its full circumference for about half the height of the cap, at which point the corners of the original cube are left projecting. These projections have then to be dealt with, and they are

brought down to meet the hemisphere in various ways, of which that shown in no. viii is the most common. The cap from Bracebridge, south opening (no. vii), is notable for its originality. The shaft supporting it possesses more-over about the best developed base that occurs in the belfries, the profile of which is given in the drawing. In the Glentworth example (no. viii), and many others of which specimens are given in the illustrations, the projecting corners of the cube are worked into volutes, while the central space on each face between the curls is left plain, as in no. viii, or treated with a drop like the so-called Tau of Early Norman caps, or some other ornamental motive. The richest in ornamentation of all is the cap from St Peter-at-Gowts, S opening (no. x), where there is considerable elegance of design and sharp and delicate cutting. The cap from the uppermost stage at Barton-on-Humber, S opening (no. xi), is, on the other hand, clumsy and unpleasing, though undoubtedly original in treatment. It passes off into the octagonal shaft which it crowns, without any neck moulding, though this is almost universal in other examples.

Perhaps the most interesting set of caps in any of the towers is that from Great Hale, near Sleaford, where there are four, nos. xii to xv, all different and all fanciful without being extravagant. In shape they are a sort of combination of the cubical with the volute form. The caps are only carved on the outer faces, and they have the peculiarity that the abacus measures rather more in the direction of the thickness of the wall than it does the other way. This gives them some slight approach to the corbel capital, branching out to take the width of the masonry, specimens of which from different regions were shown in Fig. 98. The last example no. xvi, from the N face of Glentworth tower, shows the extreme limit to which is carried this principle of corbeling out the cap to correspond with the thickness of the wall. This cap measures 11 in. on its face, but the side extends to

16 in. by a curious tongue projecting at the back. This extension is in none of the examples under consideration carried far enough to make it possible to dispense with a through-stone, but the corbel cap that is cap and through-stone in one does occur, though rarely, in our English work (Fig. 98, iv and vi), where no. iv from Jarrow is in a tower that is undoubtedly Norman work, while no. vi is in the very remarkable W tower at Sompting, Sussex, to which it will be necessary to return.

To finish with the examples in Fig. 193, no. 4 from Boothby Pagnal, Lincs., a distinctly Norman tower, is cut down with hollow not straight chamfers, and recalls the caps that surmount the columns in the gallery over the S side aisle at Gernrode, Saxony, of which Rivoira gives a figure on p. 296 of his volume II. No. 2 shows the base of the shaft of which the cap is given above it. The position of the shaft is shown in Fig. 130, on the N jamb of the W face of the arch between tower and nave at Broughton, Lincs. This it will be remembered is a case of the tower forming the body of the church, noticed as a remarkable and characteristically Saxon scheme (p. 289 f.). The base, with the double hollows, is not Saxon at all but very distinctively Norman. It is included by Ruprich-Robert among the Early Norman details belonging to XI and he notes its occurrence at Jumièges, Mont-St-Michel, and the Abbaye aux Dames, in the Duchy. It survives however into XII and is abundantly represented at Durham, where however it often shows a rather more advanced form with a fillet between the bottom of the lower hollow and the plinth. It is found too with this fillet on that isolated and very enigmatical Norman respond at the W end of the nave at Hexham noticed (p. 175). Here again is a chronological indication of obvious value, though the exact inference to be drawn from it may be uncertain.

The examples on Fig. 194 introduce quite a different element, for the generating form is the cylinder or sphere.

(*a*) is the cap of a mid-wall shaft in the E belfry opening at St Peter-at-Gowts, while (*b*) is the impost on the N jamb of the E face of the tower, or chancel, arch at Langford, Oxon, a church of great interest for the present purpose, as it exhibits on the tower, the oldest part, double splayed lights and pilaster strips in combination with belfry openings of a rather advanced type. The impost (*b*) which carries a thick soffit roll is in




FIG. 194, Tectonic capitals and bases of cylindrical or spherical origin.

profile like the Lincoln cap, and parallels would not be easy to find. The example (*c*) is from one of the piers of the nave arcade in the extremely interesting church at Great Paxton, near St Neots, Hunts., where as we have seen (p. 368) there are recognizable Anglo-Saxon features combined with rather advanced elements, the source of which has to be sought elsewhere, though not necessarily in Normandy.

Of the other examples in Fig. 194, (*d*) is a capital from

the blind arcade on the walls of the slype at Worcester, a well known example of Early Norman work in this country. The capital, which is accompanied in the arcading by other examples of a cylindrical form, is of a kind that is comparatively rare, whereas the bulbous bases which correspond to these capitals are fairly common in Early Norman surroundings, e.g. in the monastic buildings at Jarrow; in the Early Norman pier of the chancel arch at Monkwearmouth (f); below a shaft crowned by a Norman scalloped capital in the clerestory of the S transept of Oxford cathedral (g); and in the tower at Dunham Magna, Norfolk (p. 346) (e). These places it may be said are all British, and Rivoira regards the base as a Saxon survival.¹ In the Duchy however, and in connection with work that dates before or about the time of the Conquest, a base approaching more or less the same form but not of nearly so swelling an outline, occurs near the entrance to the crypt at Ste-Trinité, Caen, and in the earlier church of Cerisy-la-Forêt begun in 1030, while pre-Conquest Saxon work does not show it. It must be regarded therefore as a Norman contribution to the joint work of this transitional period. It does not however occur in the W towers, with which we are here specially concerned. It agrees with this Norman attribution to find the bulbous or globular cap in the S porch of the interesting church at Stottesdon in Shropshire, of which the Rev. D. Cranage² is inclined to make the W end Saxon, though on the strength of the sculptured tympanum we have assigned it to the Norman side (p. 394).

The inferences to be drawn from the facts given above about the W towers are pretty obvious. Many perhaps the majority of the towers were erected after the Conquest and under a régime which at any rate politically was Norman.³

¹ *l.c.*, II, 215.

² *The Churches of Shropshire*, Wellington, 1894, etc.

³ On the special and interesting case of certain towers in Lincoln City itself, see (pp. xiv f., 466 f.).

The social and industrial organization of the land especially the rural districts was probably Normanized to an extent varying in different parts. We can see to this day up and down the country the earthworks of the fortified dwellings of the new Norman lords, but their relations with the population in daily life must have depended on personal and local conditions at which we can do little more than guess. A healthy and energetic noble or prelate might surround himself with an entourage of his own countrymen fit to conduct all the operations of life, while a new manorial lord of less equipment might find it best to cultivate friendly relations with his neighbours, and to exploit local resources for whatever he wanted done. Norman master builders were of course brought over in large numbers and their services would naturally be requisitioned primarily for the greater undertakings. In these Rivoira believes it possible to distinguish between the more difficult parts of the work such as the vaulting where only Normans would be employed, and the easier jobs on the details and mouldings which might be left to Saxon hands.¹ The scheme of these greater buildings would certainly be Norman, though even here, in certain structures such as the above mentioned W tower at Ely, a Saxon influence survives. On the other hand in the more modest country or town churches of the parish type Saxon fashions are in evidence in the main scheme, while the presence of Norman masons may only make itself apparent in the details. Longated plans, lofty walls, thin walls, W towers, even in the case of Broughton a tower forming the body of a church, give a Saxon stamp to a work as a whole, though the evidence such as a detail as the Broughton base, Fig. 193, no. 2, of the absence of Norman masons may prove conclusively a post-conquest date. This, it must be observed, does not make Anglo-Saxon architecture a less substantial and important thing but rather increases any respect we may feel for it, as

¹ *Lombardic Architecture*, II, 195.

showing that at the Conquest it was a going concern with enough vitality in it to survive in face of superior Norman work. In the first edition of this volume it was pointed out that Anglo-Saxon work is identified by its character and not by the mere fact that it dates before the Conquest, while it does not lose its identity if it be actually wrought a few years after that event; so in the present issue the inclusion of the examples now under review under a separate heading by printing their names in the Alphabetical List in italics does not take them out of the Saxon category, but calls attention to an interesting sub-chapter in the

history of English architecture as a whole. Saxons and Normans working together on English churches of the latter part of XI and even the first part of XII introduce quite a pleasant and even idyllic touch into the picture of the times (p. 433).

For elongated proportions, as giving a Saxon appearance to a nave that may after all be Norman from the first, a reference may be made to the remarkable church at Ickleton, Cambs., Fig. 195. The nave here is 57 ft. 6 in. long by a width of only 14 ft. 3 in., that is, it is fully four times as long as it is broad, and the proportions are for a Norman scheme quite abnormal. The




FIG. 195, Arcade on S side of Ickleton Church, Cambs.

walls are 2 ft. 6 in. thick, their height which is considerable may be conditioned by the later clearstory. These walls are pierced by simple but noble square-sectioned

arches c. 11 ft. 6 in. in span, with capitals below their springing 2 ft. 10 in. square that are in four cases upborne by ancient Roman cylindrical shafts from a large neighbouring villa and farm. Only 1 ft. 9 in. above the crown of each of these arches are the sills of internally splayed r. h. lights, and these are so low, and look so poor in comparison with the arcade, that one would say with confidence that it is the case of Norman arches cut through an older Saxon wall, did not the fact that the windows are so accurately spaced in relation to the arches make them look like parts of the same work. There is a N aisle that is only 6 ft. 9 in. wide. The proportions and the thin walls are however undoubtedly Saxon, and the interesting church aptly illustrates the theme of the present chapter.

In the case of lofty walls, not modified by later clearstory arrangements, Stoughton, near Chichester, Sussex, is a useful example. It is a fine cruciform church nobly placed and in early times it was ecclesiastically important, though now it has only a few farms about it. The fine chancel arch with volute caps and other characteristics show that it is really a Norman church but it has Saxon features, and the soffit roll of the chancel arch has been mentioned (p. 400). The position of the tower over the S transept has been referred to (p. 329). This transept and that to N have in their W walls double splayed r. h. lights, the openings in which, nearer to the outer than the inner face of the wall (c. 10 in. as against 1 ft. 7 in.), measure 4 ft. 2 in. by 1 ft. 1 in. The walls are only 2 ft. 6 in. thick and Col. Jessep¹ makes them nearly 30 ft. high.

The adoption of the W tower by the Normans as part of the church plan has already furnished matter for comment (p. 385), but it is noteworthy that the Anglo-Saxon tall and slender proportions were sometimes taken over by the Normans though their own towers were as a rule of sturdier build.

¹ *Saxon Architecture in Sussex*, Lond., Simpkin, no date, p. 39.

The most striking case is that of Monkwearmouth which has mid-wall work in the belfry openings and strip-work round them, and is singularly slender for its height of 60 ft., though this is of course due to the narrowness, about 11 ft., of the earlier porch (p. 130). It is curious that at about the same time a tower was being built at the sister establishment of Jarrow, and this is obviously Norman work though there are Saxon belfry openings, Fig. 98, iv. The early Norman monastic buildings of which there are considerable remains are no doubt contemporary with the tower, and it looks as if all the available Norman or Normanized masons were put on to the Jarrow work, and only Saxons employed for the Monkwearmouth tower.

Some instructive illustrations of this overlap are to be found in some of the churches on the Yorkshire wolds, such as Appleton-le-Street, Wharram-le-Street, and Weaverthorpe, all of the plain Saxon character and lofty proportions. The last named is the latest of the three, but it is taken first for the reason that it can be dated with certainty, and this gives it for the present purpose special importance. In a recent paper in *Archaeologia*, Vol. LXXII, by Mr John Bilson, it has been proved, on the strength of a hitherto misread inscription on a sundial, to date from the second decade of XII. Apart from its slender proportions the tower has a Saxon-looking plain tall and narrow opening to the nave, c. 18 ft. 6 in. by 7 ft. 2 in., and high up on its E face a square doorway which, as in so many Saxon towers, would have given access from the ringing chamber to a space between the ceiling and the upper roof of the nave. The belfry openings would excite suspicion as one of them, on S, is recessed on the jambs, but the others are cut straight through the wall and have mid-wall shafts and through-stones, though the arch above is recessed on both faces. In summarizing his description Mr Bilson notices 'the survival, nearly half-a-century after the Conquest, of certain characteristics of the

English building-manner of the days before the Conquest,' and he instances 'the relative thinness of the ashlar-faced walls'—they are only 2 ft. 4 in. thick—'the absence of the usual pilaster buttresses, and the tall proportion of the unbuttressed tower.'

At Wharram-le-Street the belfry openings are of the normal 'Lincolnshire' kind and are flanked by pilaster strips, but the Saxon appearance of the tall unbuttressed tower is modified when we note the Norman character of the details in the arched openings on the ground story. The tower arch especially looks Norman and the arch itself is distinctly horseshoed (p. 29). The writer just quoted makes Wharram earlier than Weaverthorpe but decidedly post-Conquest. The cap of the W doorway, the archivolt mouldings of which are, like those of Branston, Fig. 177, of Norman type, is given Fig. 193, 1. See *Archaeologia*, LXXIII, and (p. 485).

Appleton-le-Street though resembling the other two is on the other side of the line, for here in the tower we have two distinct periods, the uppermost stage exhibiting Norman detail while the lower stages show nothing that is not Saxon in character. It is remarkable however that the tower is of heavier proportions than the other two which we have seen reason to consider later in date. There is mid-wall work in two stages. In the uppermost, where the walling is of more regular masonry than in the parts below, there are original shafts N, W, and S (E is a restoration) and they are square in section save in the front where they swell out into a semicircle. On this curved outermost face there is on N and S carved chevron ornament and on W spiral ornament. There are no caps but the through-stone rests on the top of the shaft. Any one looking at these enriched shafts would put the tower down as Norman, but the work below is sufficiently different in character to make it safe to ascribe it to Saxon hands. The treatment of the double openings here

The most striking case is that of Monkwearmouth which has mid-wall work in the belfry openings and strip-work round them, and is singularly slender for its height of 60 ft., though this is of course due to the narrowness, about 11 ft., of the earlier porch (p. 130). It is curious that at about the same time a tower was being built at the sister establishment of Jarrow, and this is obviously Norman work though there are Saxon belfry openings, Fig. 98, iv. The early Norman monastic buildings of which there are considerable remains are no doubt contemporary with the tower, and it looks as if all the available Norman or Normanized masons were put on to the Jarrow work, and only Saxons employed for the Monkwearmouth tower.

Some instructive illustrations of this overlap are to be found in some of the churches on the Yorkshire wolds, such as Appleton-le-Street, Wharram-le-Street, and Weaverthorpe, all of the plain Saxon character and lofty proportions. The last named is the latest of the three, but it is taken first for the reason that it can be dated with certainty, and this gives it for the present purpose special importance. In a recent paper in *Archaeologia*, Vol. LXXII, by Mr John Bilson, it has been proved, on the strength of a hitherto misread inscription on a sundial, to date from the second decade of XII. Apart from its slender proportions the tower has a Saxon-looking plain tall and narrow opening to the nave, c. 18 ft. 6 in. by 7 ft. 2 in., and high up on its E face a square doorway which, as in so many Saxon towers, would have given access from the ringing chamber to a space between the ceiling and the upper roof of the nave. The belfry openings would excite suspicion as one of them, on S, is recessed on the jambs, but the others are cut straight through the wall and have mid-wall shafts and through-stones, though the arch above is recessed on both faces. In summarizing his description Mr Bilson notices 'the survival, nearly half-a-century after the Conquest, of certain characteristics of the

English building-manner of the days before the Conquest,' and he instances 'the relative thinness of the ashlar-faced walls'—they are only 2 ft. 4 in. thick—'the absence of the usual pilaster buttresses, and the tall proportion of the unbuttressed tower.'

At Wharram-le-Street the belfry openings are of the normal 'Lincolnshire' kind and are flanked by pilaster strips, but the Saxon appearance of the tall unbuttressed tower is modified when we note the Norman character of the details in the arched openings on the ground story. The tower arch especially looks Norman and the arch itself is distinctly horseshoed (p. 29). The writer just quoted makes Wharram earlier than Weaverthorpe but decidedly post-Conquest. The cap of the W doorway, the archivolt mouldings of which are, like those of Branston, Fig. 177, of Norman type, is given Fig. 193, 1. See *Archaeologia*, LXXIII, and (p. 485).

Appleton-le-Street though resembling the other two is on the other side of the line, for here in the tower we have two distinct periods, the uppermost stage exhibiting Norman detail while the lower stages show nothing that is not Saxon in character. It is remarkable however that the tower is of heavier proportions than the other two which we have seen reason to consider later in date. There is mid-wall work in two stages. In the uppermost, where the walling is of more regular masonry than in the parts below, there are original shafts N, W, and S (E is a restoration) and they are square in section save in the front where they swell out into a semicircle. On this curved outermost face there is on N and S carved chevron ornament and on W spiral ornament. There are no caps but the through-stone rests on the top of the shaft. Any one looking at these enriched shafts would put the tower down as Norman, but the work below is sufficiently different in character to make it safe to ascribe it to Saxon hands. The treatment of the double openings here

is much the same as it is above but the shafts are plain. They have however bases of the bulbous form. The quoining and masonry look Saxon. At Weaverthorpe and Wharram the quoins are in stones of a moderate size set Stow fashion, but at Appleton-le-Street though set in the same fashion they are decidedly larger and have the rugged Saxon look about them. One measures 3 ft. 6 in. N to S by 1 ft. W to E, with a height of 1 ft. 2 in. The W doorway has been blocked and is now a window, while the tower arch is later, of the end of XII. The tower walls are about 3 ft. thick save in E where they measure about 2 ft. 7 in. and this corresponds with the nave walls which are only 2 ft. 3 in. or 2 ft. 2 in. thick and are decidedly lofty. The SW nave quoin shows the same big stones as the tower, and the walls are Saxon with later arcades cut through them when aisles were added.

It is of course impossible for reasons of space to pursue in detail the analysis of these numerous towers in which Saxon and Norman elements seem to meet. Save in E Anglia we should date the towers, that have given up l. and s. quoins and double splayed lights but keep the mid-wall work, from about the middle of XI to the beginning of XII, but in Norfolk and Suffolk where the round towers show no quoins the double splayed lights certainly last on into the Early Norman period. Such towers are numerous, and some like Haddiscoe, Norfolk, and Herringfleet in Suffolk, have quite distinct Norman detail in their double belfry openings that are of Saxon parentage. St Mary Coslaney, Norwich, has recently been signalized as Saxon on the evidence of opened-out belfry mid-wall work, but the shafts here under the through-stones are crowned by low but well-formed mitred cubical caps, and there are quirked chamfers on such of the original through-stones and imposts that still remain. It is said¹ that the original shafts, through-stones, and imposts were of Caen stone. Similar belfry openings are to be

¹ *Norfolk Archaeology*, xvii, 31.

seen elsewhere in E Anglia, notably at Beechamwell in mid-Norfolk and (probably) at Burnham Deepdale in the north. In these openings the two small arches on each side of the mid-wall shaft are straight sided and were constructed over centerings of wooden boards, or, on the exterior third of the thickness of the wall, of stone slabs. At Beechamwell some of the wooden boards still remain in built-up openings. Here the nave of the church on its NW quoin has distinct l. and s. work which counts in E Anglia for more than the suspiciously common double splayed window, and the church may be placed on the Saxon side of the Conquest year. The tower arch turned in rubble looks early.

Among these numerous round W towers of E Anglia only some can be mentioned as the present writer does not pretend to have been able to see them all.¹ In *Norfolk Churches* by J. Charles Cox the number of round towers in Norfolk is put down at 130 with 40 in Suffolk, and this author thinks the majority are Norman and a few later, while a fair number date in the Saxon period. These last he placed on the following list, in which the present writer has employed capital letters for the churches that have definite Saxon features over and above double splayed windows and mid-wall work, while italics indicate examples which the writer has seen and places on his own Saxo-Norman roll. Aslacton, Bawburgh, BEECHAMWELL (l. and s. quoins), Beeston St Lawrence, *Bessingham*, Cranwich, Fishley, *Forncett St Peter*, Framingham Earl (Norman), *Gissing*, *Haddiscoe*, *Howe*, Kilverstone, EAST LEXHAM (transenna), West Lexham (not Saxon), Great Melton, *St Mary Coslaney*, *Norwich*, Little Plumpstead, Roughton, Great Ryburgh, Tasburgh (Norman), Thorpe next Haddiscoe, Threxton.

To this list fall to be added in Norfolk *St Julian, Norwich* ;

¹ There are papers on the Round Towers of this region in *Archaeologia*, xxiii ; *Journal of Archaeological Association*, xxi, xxxvii, xlv, xlv, xlviii ; and on Saxon Architecture in Norfolk in the *Archaeological Journal*, vi.

and *Colney*, for double splayed lights in the towers, and *Herringfleet*, Suffolk, for mid-wall work.




FIG. 196, Bessingham Church, Norfolk.

Plans of two Norfolk churches with round W towers are given on this page. Fig. 196 is Bessingham near Cromer, and Fig. 197 is Witton to W of Norwich

where there are double splayed windows in the nave, a feature specially common in this region.

It was noticed on an early page of this volume (p. 65) that irregularities in arch construction was a useful criterion




Fig. 197, Witton Church, Norfolk.

for separating Late Saxon work from Norman. Some Norfolk churches, with others in different districts, supply curious illustrations of this in the form of arches constructed generally of re-used Roman bricks put together in quite blundering fashion. We saw (p. 67) that the Saxon mason showed sometimes that he did not know how to begin an arch of the kind, Fig. 36, and now the churches just referred to exhibit a similar incompetency in finishing it at the crown. Fig. 198 gives us three examples in which the voussoirs as they approach the centre from the two sides are set at

wrong angles and leave a wedge shaped space between them at the crown that has to be filled up anyhow. Could a Norman mason we may ask ever make such a mistake in arch construction in which he was so thoroughly schooled? Is not this detail, trivial in itself, a useful distinguishing mark? No. I in Fig. 198 is from Great Melton, Norfolk, a church which is apparently devoid of any distinctively Saxon suggestions and can furnish no satisfactory answer. No. II is from the Norfolk church, Thornage, that does possess Saxon 'indi-




FIG. 198, Faulty arch technique.

cations though not perhaps convincing ones. No. III supplies what is needed, for the portion of arch shown, that is turned in stone and not in bricks, is the head of one of eight double splayed windows in the walls of the fine Saxon nave of Tredington, Worcestershire, 56 ft. 6 in. long by 21 ft. 3 in. wide. The windows are blocked, and cut into though not destroyed by arcades of transitional date, but are quite clear and are all constructed of stones of the character shown in the drawing laid in the peculiar fashion under consideration. One of the eight has been partly opened to show the double splay. The stone-built walls are 2 ft. 10 in. thick.

Tredington fixes the peculiar technique as Saxon, and it may be used to date Lower Halstow in Kent, where the S chancel wall 1 ft. 5 in. thick has a built up opening of the kind. The fact that this thin wall was lengthened eastwards with masonry 3 in. thicker increases the likelihood that the earlier work is Saxon.

The reader may find something almost meticulous in this insistence on small details, but reference may be made to what was said at the outset (pp. v, xvi, 2) about the value of such criteria. The theme could easily be pursued further but the point has probably now been sufficiently elaborated. One reference may however be added. It is to the Buckinghamshire church of Lavendon which has really no definite and distinctive marks either Saxon or Norman, but only indications such as herring-bone work confined to the upper stages of the tower, nave walls 2 ft. 6 in. thick, and so on, but there are two old windows showing rubble construction and of these that, now blocked, in the N wall of the nave has its voussoirs at proper angles while a small light in the tower is headed like Tredington. The general look of the church has given it a place in Saxon lists, but it is probably post-Conquest and representative of the Saxo-Norman overlap, which we may suggest these two windows illustrate.

The illustrations now given of this overlap include nothing more striking than the case of Broughton near Brigg (p. 291 f.) which is really remarkable as the perpetuation of a Saxon scheme that had no place at all in Norman building traditions. Another point of some interest though a minor one is the appearance of well-constructed normal l. and s. quoining at the angles of a noble and characteristically Norman central tower. This phenomenon meets us at the familiar church of Cholsey near Wallingford, Berks. No one who enters this fine building and is confronted by the massive and grammatically treated tower arches can doubt for a moment that this central tower the walls of which are nearly 6 ft. thick is

Norman work, yet the lower parts of the tower quoins where they appear in the external view, at each corner save that to SW which is masked by a stair turret, exhibit the unmistakable Anglo-Saxon l. and s. technique, used evidently with deliberation and care. Seeing that the evidence of the 'Lincolnshire' towers where this technique does not occur seems to show that it was passing out of use about the middle of XI, this revival at Cholsey is quite a notable fact.

Long and short work in quoins and Escomb fashion in jambs are so alien to Norman practice that their appearance in a distinctly Norman setting is always a clear indication of the overlap. Fig. 199 is from the E jamb of the N doorway of the nave at Stow, and is obvious Norman work of XII. The cap is of the scalloped form, and is in logical relation to the moulded archivolt above it, enriched with the XII motive of the chevron. There are at the same time in the work two distinct survivals of older methods and details. The jambs are constructed with an obvious reminiscence of the Escomb technique, and the cubical upper part of the cap is enriched with the traditional Saxon step-pattern ornament discussed and illustrated (p. 279 f. and Fig. 121).




FIG. 199, Angle shaft of N doorway of nave at Stow, Lincolnshire.

Taking the Saxon elements in the transitional structures we have in view we seem to see that the Normans took most kindly to the mid-wall work, and to double splayed windows, quite a number of which, especially in E Anglia and in Sussex, must be of post-Conquest date. The latter would be quite natural, as this treatment of openings for light suits the thick Norman walls (p. 23), and it is surprising that the Normans of the Duchy did not adopt the form as soon as they began seriously to build. The Saxon mid-wall work however is a clumsy arrangement, far inferior to the recessing traditional with the Normans, Fig. 98, though for some reason the Saxon device remained in favour, and appears in XII work that in other details is wholly Norman. Of the other Saxon features the one that the Normans would least understand is the pilaster strip. If a Norman lord put some building into the hands of the Saxon craftsmen of his domain and saw them working decorative Lisenen on their wall surfaces he would remark their superficial likeness to the flat pilaster buttresses he was accustomed to in his own country. A moment's consideration however would show the essential difference between the purely decorative and the constructive features. The buttresses as he knew them wherever they came were elements of strength, whereas the Saxon substitutes he would condemn as mere frivolity. Hence there is to the writer's knowledge only one example of the pilaster strip used on a distinctly Norman building, and this is at Milborne Port, near Sherborne, Somerset. The chancel here is undoubtedly Norman and has blocked Norman windows in the N and S walls but the W part of the exterior wall on S is treated in its upper section with what looks like an attempt to enrich with pilaster strips a casually selected piece of walling. There seems no sense or fitness in the arrangement and it must be regarded as in the nature of a freak.

There is moreover one example in which an attempted compromise between Lisene and flat buttress is apparent. This

is the axial tower at Langford, Oxon, already referred to (p. 415). Here are pilaster strips quite shallow—2 in. in projection—and devoid of all buttressing power but broader than is usual and running a little over 12 in. in width. Where they end under the string course below the belfry openings, which are of advanced character, there is a kind of stepped capital and a stepped base below. These details are characteristically Saxon (p. 280) and occur also on the jambs of the square headed opening in the W wall of the tower over the tower arch, as seen from the nave. The strips however embrace the corners of the tower and this arrangement reproduces that common with Norman buttresses, Fig. 93. There is clear evidence here of an unconscious compromise.

For quoining the Normans evidently preferred the common sense arrangement of stones laid Stow fashion, and the Saxon masons would meet them there, for all through the Saxon period, from Escomb onwards, this method of laying the big stones they favoured was in use, as well as the adjustment of big stones in an upright position at the corners, as at the early St Peter-on-the-Wall, Essex, Fig. 48, or the late St Mildred, Canterbury, Fig. 5. If Saxon builders picked out the biggest stones they could find for the quoining Norman directors of the work would not object, and in some cases such as Duntisbourne Rous in the Cotswolds, Fig. 179, they adopted the local fashion.

In the case of the decorative details on caps and imposts in these transitional buildings, some indication has already been given of how they are to be distributed between Saxons and Normans. Sig. Rivoira¹ and Mr John Bilson² agree that the volutes and the upright leaves are Norman, but the caps that show them in Fig. 192 look more like crude Saxon attempts to imitate newly introduced Norman forms than the work of Norman carvers themselves. The Ionic and foliage caps in the Duchy, as in the crypt at Ste-Trinité,

¹ *Lombardic Architecture*, II, 186.

² Private communication.

Caen, are much more workmanlike. Austrasian models for some of these volute and foliage caps were also available, and Fig. 200, from the W end of the Schloss Kirche at Quedlinburg,¹ Saxony, is curiously like the cap no. VIII from Glentworth, Fig. 192, so that the genesis and history of these




FIG. 200, Cap from W end of Schloss Kirche, Quedlinburg, Saxony.

curious Late Saxon belfry caps is not so simple as it may appear. The gap also between the cut-down cubical caps like Fig. 192, no. 1, Fig. 193, no. 2, etc., and the fully formed ones, nos. II, III, IV in Fig. 192, also needs filling, for at present the jump from one to the other seems very sudden.

Apart from the caps there is very instructive work to be seen on the imposts of the tower arch at Sompting, Sussex, Fig. 201. The carving here is so remarkable that a suggestion has been made that it is ancient Roman, but there can be no doubt that the cap of the half-column, above which is the familiar soffit roll like that under the tower arch at Langford, Fig. 194, *b*, is enriched with upright leaves like those of the Scartho cap, Fig. 192, no. IX, and is probably of Norman importation. The volutes at the sides are much stranger. Sompting has other indications of a proportionally advanced date, in that while the exterior shows Austrasian pilaster strips these take the form of half-rounds while the horizontal string course that intersects them is enriched with Norman-

¹ The actual cap as sketched by the writer seems to belong to the modern rebuilding of the W end of the Schloss Kirche, but that it is a true reproduction is proved by the fact that there is an original cap of almost the same form in the crypt, dated by Dehio (with a query) to X.

like billet ornament. It is curious to find these late details conjoined with the form of the tower roof which is the most distinctively Austrasian of any of the features with which we have had to deal. This roof must keep the tower within




FIG. 201, Impost and cap of soffit shaft from S jamb of tower arch, Sompting, Sussex.

XI rather than XII to which latter century Rivoira assigns it. There is figure carving and interlacing work within the, substantially Norman, church, but there is nothing distinctively Saxon about the former, and the interlacing bands, on what was once a string course, have foliated terminals that suggest XII. On the subject of the Sompting sculp-

ture, and other figured panels that occur in Saxon or in Saxo-Norman churches, the reader is referred to what was said in the Preface (p. xiii f.).

Mounting to the belfry stage we find on each of the N and S faces of the tower two double openings with mid-wall shafts, and on each of the E and W two single openings with triangular heads. This duplication of the openings is rendered necessary by the presence of the upright pilaster strip (p. 392), and this is motived by the form of the roof, so that the tower must have been designed as a whole as we

have it. In these double belfry openings we find examples of the corbel caps already referred to (p. 247 f.). Three of them are of the form shown in Fig. 98, no. vi, and the volutes here may be accepted as a Norman contribution, but that in the NW double opening is of the simpler shape of B in Fig. 202, where it is placed in




FIG. 202, Corbel caps.

- A. Corbel cap at Trier.
- a. Base of shaft.
- B. Corbel cap at Sompting.
- b. Front view of top of cap.
- c.c. Grating that fills in the window opening.

juxtaposition with the corbel cap A in the W front at Trier on the Moselle shown above in Fig. 97. The resemblance here is almost exact, though the Sompting cap is comparatively rude in execution, and it may be regarded as bearing out the German character of the external termination of the tower.

The mention at the top of the last page of billet ornament on the external string course on Sompting tower suggests a note to the effect that of all the characteristic Norman ornamental motives this is the one first and most often, if not

exclusively, used in Saxon settings. The distinctive Norman chevron will practically never be thus found—the example in Fig. 199 is at most only connected with faint Saxon survivals—and the acanthus, which occurs in the belfry windows of Langford tower, Oxon, is in surroundings which, while advanced, are really no more Norman than Saxon. The billet moulding on the other hand is conspicuous on the triangular headed W doorway at Dunham Magna, Fig. 156, and in the belfry openings at Haddiscoe, Norfolk, and Herringfleet, Suffolk, and it occurs also on the imposts of the chancel arch at Great Paxton, Hunts. (p. 368 f.), where in itself it would fit in chronologically with other features of this interesting Late Saxon structure.

A social episode one would like to visualize is the meeting of a committee of Norman and Saxon craftsmen on the question, still often discussed in our own day, What should be done with the parish church. The men-at-arms of the lord are in the background, and he himself we will imagine presiding at the conference, for we will believe now realized the pleasant words of Ordericus Vitalis, who was born in England just at the time this might have happened. 'The English and the Normans,' he says,¹ 'were living together as fellow citizens (civiliter) in the castles and camps and towns, and were forming nuptial alliances the ones with the others. Then were being built and repaired divers churches where divine services were duly held.' Of the particular church we have in view the question would be, Is it to be rebuilt, or only enlarged by the addition of side aisles and the lengthening of the chancel, perhaps with a termination in an apse. It is a fact to the credit alike of the Saxon fabrics and of the Norman masons that in so many cases a conservative policy was adopted and the side walls were allowed to stand with their thin but homogeneous structure while the Normans cut their arcades through them in workmanlike fashion.

¹ *Hist. Eccl.*, pars II, l. iv, ch. II.

The well known antiquary Sir Henry Dryden¹ expressed some curiosity as to the practical means employed for the support of the upper part of the walls while the arches, sometimes in two orders, were inserted. 'It is certain,' he wrote, 'that the operation must have been well known in ancient times, and equally certain that modern builders would be much puzzled to perform it.' 'Want of space,' he remarks disappointingly, 'prevents a conjectural explanation of the process.'² The job was at any rate very well done, for unless the older nave windows have been partly preserved, as is so often the case, it is only by noticing the thinness of the wall or by discovering Saxon details under mediaeval or modern plaster and whitewash that the history of the fabric can now be ascertained.

It was noticed (pp. 64, 233) that the Normans seemed to possess a liking for aisled churches that the Saxons did not share, and, apart from questions of accommodation, this would account for the frequency with which the above operation was performed. The paucity of existing examples of Saxon aisled churches has more than once been referred to, but the reader was cautioned (p. 320) against assuming that these were all that the country ever had to show. It was explained in the Preface that no stress has been laid in this volume on statistical information about Saxon churches, for the preservation or destruction of the actual examples was very much a matter of chance, and we cannot tell how far the only statistics now available would apply if the whole number of Saxon churches were now extant. That Reculver, Brixworth, Lydd, Wing, and Great Paxton are the only extant Saxon aisled churches, may however stand for what it is worth.

An extension eastwards of the presbyterial region was of course in accordance with the growing elaboration of

¹ Oxfordshire Archaeological Society's *Reports*, 1885-92.

² Mr Hamilton Thompson deals in an interesting way with the process in his *Ground Plan of the English Parish Church*, Cambridge, 1913, p. 71.

ritual, but a similar elongation of the nave in the opposite direction also occurs, as at Wroxeter, only much more rarely, since the W tower would often come in the way. On this Mr Hamilton Thompson gives information in his valuable little volume just noticed, see his chapter iv.

Whether or not the extended chancel should end apsidally would depend on the technical skill available, for we have seen earlier (p. 65) that deficiency of skill in vaulting probably accounts for Saxon square ended chancels as much as does Celtic tradition. Though the Normans favoured the apse and always used it in their greater churches they did not, any more than other continental church builders, exact them always from their country masons, and in the Romanesque period, M. Enlart remarks,¹ 'les petites et moyennes églises principalement en Picardie, Ile de France, Normandie, Champagne, et Bourgogne, ont souvent un chevet rectangulaire,' while Dehio and von Bezold² note the predilection for flat eastern ends in the Romanesque of the Upper Rhine and Swabia. Hence we cannot regard the presence or absence of an apse as of any special significance. Many students however of Saxon architecture to whom 'Rome' is a word of special significance are naturally interested in this question, and the Architectural Index, sub voce 'Apse,' gives a few statistical details, which are nevertheless owing to the conditions of the problem imperfect and possibly misleading. In general it may be said with some confidence that the more important Saxon churches were as a rule apsidal but the Escomb or Boarhunt scheme of a square ended presbytery certainly prevailed in the country churches, except perhaps in the early ones in Kent.

An excellent illustration of this extension of a Saxon fabric after the Conquest is furnished by Bosham, Sussex, the Saxon plan of which is given in Fig. 203. It is complete, with

¹ *Manuel, Architecture Religieuse*, 1902, p. 223.

² *Kirchliche Baukunst*, I, 208.




FIG. 203, Plan of Bosham Church, Sussex.

[The breaks in the walls of the chancel denote extensions, first in the Early Norman, and afterwards in the Early English period. The lights high in the N wall are circular.]

W tower, nave, and short chancel (as far as the first break in the chancel walls in the plan), and this has been set out with more than mediaeval indifference to exactness in measurements and squaring, for it diverges phenomenally from the axis of the nave. The elevations are gaunt in their plainness and the now unplastered rubble work is rough and uncomely, but the dimensions are ample (p. 384), the walls, which in all parts including the tower are 2 ft. 6 in. thick, are lofty, and the chancel arch already illustrated, Fig. 187, undeniably imposing. All that the Early Normans did was to lengthen the chancel, for the middle third in the plan shows by the herring-bone work in the walling that it represents an extension of this time. Later on the side walls of the nave were cut through with Early Pointed arcades and the chancel was again lengthened. The Norman extension is said to have ended apsidally. Through all changes the original Saxon fabric has remained, and forms one of the many delightful links with the past that our early architecture provides. The Bosham church that we now see is figured in the Bayeux tapestry, and is probably the work of Harold's father or of Harold himself.

CHAPTER XIV

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF SAXON AND SAXO-NORMAN CHURCHES REPRESENTED BY EXTANT REMAINS

[The names of Saxo-Norman churches are printed in *italics*, and on the Map, Fig. 210, the same names are underlined]

IN THE following list will be found in alphabetical order the names of places where masonry of Saxon character is still to be seen, while the accompanying Map at (p. 490) indicates their local distribution. The criteria on which a place on the list has been adjudged or refused have been sufficiently explained in what has gone before. The inclusion of a building has been determined by the appearance of definite features that are known to be Saxon. In the first edition it was pointed out that in 'a few isolated instances these may represent a survival of Saxon forms in post-Conquest buildings,' but in the present edition this is said much more strongly, for a more intimate study of examples that appear to be late in the style has shown that not 'a few' but a substantial number of examples must be of post-Conquest date, and these are numerous enough to be distinguished as a separate class by having their names on the following list printed in *italics*. Such examples represent what has been termed the 'Saxo-Norman overlap' because with their Saxon features they sometimes exhibit others that are characteristically Norman and cannot well have come into use till after the Conquest. There are also, it may be explained, certain structures that are almost certainly post-Conquest in actual time but display no specially Norman details, and these may be taken to represent an advance

towards mature Romanesque forms on the part of Saxon builders who were helped by continental models not derived from the Norman Duchy. This must not however be taken to mean that the Saxons at the time of the Conquest were in a fair way to establish a consistent Romanesque style, for the difficulties in the way of this view have been referred to in the Preface (p. v) and elsewhere in the text.

The indications of date that follow the name and location of each example on the list are of a general kind. The significance of the letters A, B, and C, has been explained (p. 3 f.), and the periods thus denominated are subdivided A¹, A², A³, and so on with B and C. If A means VII and most of VIII, A¹ will serve for the first half of VII, A² for the period of Northumbrian supremacy in the latter half, and A³ for the comparatively unimportant VIII. B as a whole covers the latter part of VIII and the earlier Viking period of IX with the first half of X, but the three sub-periods of B can hardly be clearly separated. With C we come to the period of monastic revival of the latter part of X, that is denominated C¹; to the epoch of church building in early XI especially during the reign of Cnut, C²; and to the epoch of Edward the Confessor, C³, that may be regarded as running on for some decades after the Conquest. Examples of this latest time are sufficiently signalized by italics, the use of which may in the nature of the case be not always quite logical, and it will be understood that the relative proportions of the Saxon and Norman elements vary in different examples. A, B, or C alone merely mean a First, Second, or Third Period church, the date of which cannot be more nearly defined.

After the indication of date there may follow in special brackets { words calling attention to the chief, or only apparent, Saxon features in the building, or else a short general description, one of the objects of both being to serve as practical direction to the future investigator, who may often, if he explore carefully, find further Saxon indications in other parts

of the building. For example, a pre-Conquest quoin may very commonly mean that the whole wall of which it forms a part, especially in its upper portion, is of the same date, but in the absence of definite indications it is not easy to be sure about this. Such definite indications should always be carefully sought and recorded.

A few examples are in square brackets []. These are not Saxon and not properly on the list at all, but they are mentioned partly because some were on the list of 1903, and partly because others may be so generally regarded as Saxon that their exclusion would be puzzling to the reader.

The references are to the pages of the text, and an asterisk * signifies an illustration. In these references the use of the enclosing brackets is discontinued. The last set of references in each entry are to casual mentions in the text.

[St Albans, St Michael, Herts. This interesting church, the burial place of Francis Bacon, situated close to the site of the Forum of the Roman city, was in the first edition included in the Saxon list. It has an old chancel and a nave to which N and S aisles were added late in XII. Arches were then cut through the original walls and at the same time windows in these with heads turned in Roman brick were blocked and partly destroyed. The church was originally built in 950, but there was a ceremony of consecration in it at the beginning of XII. This ceremony architectural writers used to connect with the building of the aisles, in which case we should have early XII arcades cut through a wall that on this hypothesis would be pronounced a Saxon wall, and a part of the original church of 950. The wall is however of the very un-Saxon thickness of nearly 4 ft.; the proportions of the nave are quite Norman, and the arcades seem to belong to the end rather than the beginning of XII. Hence it is almost certain that the 950 church was replaced about 1100 by an aisleless Norman one, to which the consecration will refer, and that the arcades are Late Norman cut through an Early Norman wall, the windows in which will of course be Early Norman also. The attribution of any part of the existing church to X, or to Saxon times at all, must therefore be given up.

There are other instances in which advanced Norman arcades have been cut through earlier Norman walls so as to destroy Early Norman windows. One example is Fetcham in Surrey, that has been considered Saxon on the

same grounds that apply to St Michael, but the wall here is nearly 3 ft. thick, and the Norman arcade has scalloped caps of XII, so that the original wall with the windows will be Early Norman.]

ALKBOROUGH, Lincolnshire, C³ {W Tower}. In the W tower there are Roman moulded stones for imposts and base of tower arch, returned along the E and W walls for about 18 in. Jambs are treated Norman fashion. All four belfry openings have mid-wall work, with caps only worked on the outside faces. 407.

AMPNEY CRUCIS, Gloucestershire, C³ {nave ?}. The N doorway of nave, 395*, has jambs treated Escomb fashion, but this is the only distinctly Saxon feature.

AMPNEY ST PETER, *ibid.*, C³ {nave}. The nave has Saxon proportions and walls 2 ft. 3 in. thick. Tower arch, Saxon, in wall 2 ft. thick, 67*.

ST ANDREWS, ST REGULUS' CHAPEL, Fife. This well known monument in the cathedral enclosure at St Andrews exhibits Norman detail in the mouldings of the principal arches and in the corbelled string course, but Saxon proportions in the lofty, 31 ft. 9 in. high, walls of the choir, and in the square W or axial tower, the plain walls of which rise to a height of more than five times its width. Much light has been recently thrown on its history and affinities by an article by Mr John Bilson, F.S.A., in *Archaeologia*, Vol. LXXIII, 1924, in which he compares it with Wharram-le-Street in Yorkshire, 421, and connects it with the activity in church building and church management evinced by the Austin Canons of Nostell and other Yorkshire seats. Robert, bishop of St Andrews from about 1125, who must have been the builder of St Regulus', had been a canon of Nostell, and Mr Bilson thinks that he 'brought to the building of St Rule's a master-mason from Northumbria who was still working for the most part on the old English lines, with a very superficial assimilation of Norman detail.'¹ As regards the plan, all that is now in evidence is (1) a choir to the E of the tower, with certain marks, on each side of the tall moulded open arch in the E wall of the choir, that show that there was an eastern sanctuary the E termination of which is doubtful, and (2) the tower itself, about 20 ft. 6 in. square externally by a height of about 108 ft.; but there are marks on the W face of the tower that a W adjunct or a nave had been once built on there or at any rate begun. This would give the tower the axial position which is a Saxon feature, though the tower is about 2 ft. on each side narrower than the choir and nave.

¹ *Archaeologia*, l.c., p. 71.

The masonry is excellent and superior to what we find generally in Saxon work, and on the lower part of the N side of the tower the large squared stones, with mortar joints of about $\frac{3}{4}$ in., run some 21 in. in height by a length of 2 ft., 2 ft. 6 in., or 3 ft., and Mr Bilson recognizes 'this large-stone technique' as representing 'the megalithic tradition of pre-Conquest times.'¹ The features and details resemble in some respects very closely those at Wharram-le-Street which represents, 421, the Norman side of the line that bisects the period of the Saxo-Norman overlap, and the most Norman things about them are the mouldings of the greater arches which occur not only at Wharram, in the Norman crossing arches at Stow, Lincolnshire, and at post-Conquest Broughton and Branston in the same county, but in purely Norman work quoted in *Archaeologia*.² The double belfry openings on the four faces show a distinct loss of the genuine Saxon tradition and are much less Saxon than those at Wharram. They have recessed jambs that were furnished with angle shafts, and the plain cylindrical shafts are not in the proper mid-wall position but are brought out to the outer face of the walls. The back of the shafts, one of which, to S, is accessible from the modern internal stair, have however the Saxon feature of a vertical projecting fillet, as at Glentworth, Lincs., where however the strip is on the front and moulded. The shafts here, as also at the big arches below, have plain conical caps with neck moulds, that may rank with those given in Fig. 194. The through-stones and the imposts of the jambs of the belfry openings and of the arches below have the hollow chamfer 'which is not a Norman profile.'³ On the whole St Regulus', though not in England, must be pronounced a singularly good illustration of the Saxo-Norman overlap. On Restennet Priory, Forfarshire, there is a word in its place, 476. 17, 67, 327.

APPLETON-LE-STREET, Yorks., C³. A Saxon W tower with Norman additions, and Saxon nave with walls c. 2 ft. 3 in. thick, 420. 407.

ARLINGTON, Sussex, C {main fabric}. This is Saxon as is shown by l. and s. quoins SE, SW, NW of nave, and double splayed window in S wall of nave.

ARRETON, Isle of Wight, B³? {nave}. Nave 50 ft. by 24 ft., with three internally splayed small circular windows (filled in later with quatrefoils) at top of nave walls which are cut through with later arcades. A later tower has been built up against the W wall which is 2 ft. 4 in. thick. In this is the original W doorway 3 ft. 6 in. wide, with Escomb-fashion jambs, no rebate, voussoirs not through-stones. Above it an int. splayed r. h. window. No evidence of lower windows in side walls of nave. The N wall of the chancel may also be Saxon. 337.

¹ *Archaeologia*, l.c., p. 66.

² *ibid.*, p. 64.

³ *ibid.*, p. 58.

AVEBURY, Wilts, C¹ {nave}. Nave 41 ft. by 22 ft., over 26 ft. high, with walls 2 ft. 7 in. thick, well built, 58; windows in two stories, 37; no evidence of a Saxon W tower. 34, 337.

AYCLIFFE, Durham, C {nave}. Walls of nave 2 ft. 6 in. thick, extended later westwards leaving traces of original l. and s. W quoins in N and S walls.

LITTLE BARDFIELD, Essex, C³ {nave and W tower}. A flint-rubble tower, 22 ft. wide on W face, is Saxon almost to the summit, where there is a little herring-boning, with modern battlements and low wooden spire; many r. h. openings cut straight through the tower walls with arches wider than the space between jambs, 29; double openings divided only by a rubble pier, 446, 466; in S wall of nave, about 3 ft. thick, is a blocked double splayed r. h. window; chancel and tower arch are later. 245.

BARDSEY, Yorks., B {porch-tower and nave} 191 f. Nave c. 31 ft. by 15 ft. 3 in., with walls 2 ft. thick; porch with N door and int. splayed lights; later Saxon tower over porch; mid-wall shaft, 263*. 58, 329, 332, 373, 402.

BARHAM, Suffolk, C {remains of l. and s. work on quoins}.

BARHOLME, Lincs.,¹ C³ {S wall of nave with moulded plinth and enriched S doorway with pilaster strip above, ending in string course} 406. Mouldings of plinth and impost of S door, 405*. 240.

BARNACK, Northants, C¹ {W tower} 271 f.*****. Profiles of mouldings, 281*, 405*. Under the first reference will be found a fairly full account of the important example. 36, 187, 212, 256, 315, 319, 331 f., 403.

BARROW, Salop, C {chancel with possibly nave}. Double splayed window NE corner of chancel; pilaster strip on N chancel wall; stepped base to chancel walls; good chancel arch and excellent stone masonry.


WEST BARSHAM, Norfolk, C {nave}. A nave, 35 ft. 3 in. by 18 ft. 8 in., has a r. h. double splayed window in the S wall, and two circular double splayed lights in the N wall.

BARTON-ON HUMBER, Lincs., C¹ {tower and W adjunct, with marks of chancel} 288 f.****. Tower forming the body of the church, 289; section showing upper stages of tower and W adjunct, 341*; subdivided opening, 34*; double splayed windows in W adjunct, 36*. See first reference for full account. 99, 243, 257, 262, 271, 336, 408.

¹ *Notes on Barholme Church, Lincolnshire*, by Rev. G. M. Livett, F.S.A., Hon. Canon of Rochester.

- BEDFORD, ST PETER**, C² {axial, formerly W, tower, and chancel, formerly nave} 347. L. and s. NW quoin of chancel; arch in N wall of tower of curious form.
- BEECHAMWELL**, Norfolk, C³ {nave} 423. L. and s. quoins at NW angle of nave; round W tower with mid-wall work of late character; tower arch turned in rubble, 423; built-in fragments, 277. 407.
- BESSINGHAM**, Norfolk, C³ {round W tower with mid-wall work} 423. Plan, 424*.
- BIBURY**, Gloucestershire, C {several distinct pre-Conquest remains}. A double splayed window in S wall of nave, Saxon jambs to chancel arch, remains of Rood above.
- BILLINGHAM**, Durham, C³ {nave and W tower}. Transenna, 35, narrow doorway in place of tower arch with hollow chamfered impost, 30, 406; built-in fragments, 277. 200, 406.
- BIRSTALL**, Leicestershire, C¹ {window in N wall of chancel discovered 1869}. Window probably at first double splayed; in the middle of the wall are the remains of a transenna or pierced wooden slab with tracery like the pierced stone slab at Barnack,¹ 36, 274.
- BISHOPSTONE**, Sussex, B³ or C {S porch and considerable portions of nave walls} 191 f.**. Porch, 302; Saxon sundial, 15. 78, 296.
- BITTON**, Gloucestershire, C {nave with blocked archway to chapel or transept E end of N wall of nave}. Other Saxon indications are remains of older chancel arch; marks of Rood at a great height in E wall of nave; and great length of nave, 384.
- BOARHUNT**, Hants, C³ {main fabric} 309. Plan, 309*; chancel window, 310*; pilaster strip up gable, 309. 36, 240, 342.
- BOLAM**, Northumberland, C³ {W tower and portion of N wall of nave}. Corbel cap on mid-wall shafts in belfry, 248.
- [Bolney, Sussex, Norman, 370. Archivolt of S door enriched, like Wivelsfield, 487, with mouldings in two orders round and angular.]
- BOSHAM**, Sussex, C³ {complete with W tower, nave, and chancel afterwards lengthened} 435*. Nave wall pierced with later arcades; small circular clearstory windows survive in N wall; chancel arch, 399*. W end interior, 334, 335**. 34, 67, 193, 291, 332, 384.

¹ Information and drawing kindly furnished by Mr Thos. H. Fosbrooke, architect, Leicester.






FIG. 204, Bracebridge Church, near Lincoln.

— W. H. and 1902

- ST. BOTOLPH, Sussex, C³ {chancel arch with half-round column on soffit of jamb and half-round roll under soffit of arch} 398. Wall 2 ft. 8 in. thick.
- BRACEBRIDGE, Lincolnshire, C³ {W tower and main fabric} 411. L. and s. quoins on four corners of nave but not on tower, 389; view, Fig. 204. 411 f.
- BRADFORD-ON-AVON, Wilts, C¹ or ² {complete Saxon church} 296 f.***. Arcading, 298 f.*; narrow doorways, 303; carved angel from Rood, 303 f.*. 11, 17, 70, 160, 280, 346, 348.
- BRANSTON, Lincolnshire, C³ {W tower with mid-wall work with advanced cubical caps; Norman arcading on lower part of W face and signs of it on S} 390*. L. and s. on S quoin of nave; the arcading dates the work as post-Conquest and it is influenced by the W front of Lincoln. 411, 421.
- BREAMORE, Hants, C¹ {large Saxon church practically complete} 350 f. Plan, 349*; view, 350*; Saxon inscription, 351*; pilaster strip, 241*. Upper part of chancel walls are later. 296, 373, 384.
- BREMHILL, Wilts, C {nave}. Walls 2 ft. 1 in. thick with l. and s. quoins well marked at NW.
[East Bridgford, Notts. In the course of works carried on at this church in 1902 and 1914 remains of a church, believed by Mr du Boulay Hill on good grounds to be Saxon, were discovered, but nothing distinctive is to be seen above ground.]
- BRIGSTOCK, Northants, C¹ {W tower with half-round stair turret to W, 338; nave}. Nave 40 ft. 4 in. by 15 ft. preserved above later arcades with old windows partly seen; fine door and window openings, 30**; l. and s. quoins to nave seen inside church; strip-work round noble tower arch with jambs Escomb fashion and plain square imposts, Fig. 11. The church is constructed of strong, rude, stone-rubble work. 187, 338.
- BRITTFORD, Wilts, B³ or C¹ {nave, enriched archways to side chapels}. Described and discussed, 220 f.; sculpture on jamb of N opening, 207*; plan, 221*; jambs, 66*, 223***. 141, 203, 348, 384.
- BRIXWORTH, Northants, A² {large basilican apsidal church of VII with modifications in later Saxon times}. Described and discussed, 104 f.*****; windows, 108; arches, 107; use of tufa, 115. Passim.
- BROUGHTON, Lincolnshire, C³ {tower formerly body of the church, W stair turret} 291 f.***; Norman detail, 414, Fig. 193; post-Conquest date, 292, 417, 426. 339 f., 398, 410.
- N BURCOMBE, Wilts, C {l. and s. quoins to chancel at NE and SE}.
- BURGHWALLIS, Yorks., near Doncaster, C³. A W tower, nave, chancel, and N chapel, Norman in fabric as is shown by the large amount of strong

herring-bone work in stone in the lower stages of the walling. The quoins have large stones set Stow fashion, and there is a Saxon massiveness about that to SW. The tower, entered through a pointed tower arch, has intersplayed r. h. lights in its lower story, and an upper doorway in the E wall above the tower arch, but, higher up, in the belfry openings we have a curious presentation of mid-wall work in its last stage of decline. There are double openings, but the side arches have pointed heads. The through-stones are plain and rude with plain thin shafts beneath them backed up with rubble masonry, 443, 466.

LITTLE BYTHAM, Lincolnshire, C {l. and s. work at SE quoin of nave}.

BYWELL ST ANDREW, Northumberland, C³ {nave and W tower of 'Lincolnshire' type}. The W tower quoins and W quoins of nave are constructed of massive stones of Saxon character. The tower has a string course below belfry openings which on all four sides have mid-wall work and strip-work round the openings; above each double opening there are three circular apertures and to S below the string course is a single r. h. opening with strip-work round it. The N and S walls of the nave, about 2 ft. 6 in. thick, were originally higher than at present as is witnessed by marks on the tower. The E nave quoins are hidden.

CABOURN, Lincs., C³. A 'Lincolnshire' tower with Norman features; belfry stage renewed.

CAMBRIDGE,¹ ST BENET (for St Benedict), C³ {W tower, nave}. If the chancel had not been removed in 1872 by Blomfield, who reported that the E wall of it was original,² we should have a singularly complete Late Saxon church of normal plan—W tower, nave, square ended chancel. The upper part of the W tower, see 392, is shown in Fig. 180 B, but recent investigations by Dr Louis Cobbett indicated that on each face the two tall r. h. windows flanking the mid-wall openings are insertions, the date of which is given by an inscription over one of them, R 1586 P, which has generally been referred to some reparation. Internally the tower opens to the nave through the well known monumental tower arch which has moulded imposts and strip-work round the opening consisting in a square and a rounded order, an arrangement we find at the tower arch at Skipwith, Yorks., and also, so far as the jambs are concerned, at Stow, c. 1040. This may give a date for St Benet. The archivolt strips spring from the bodies of couchant lions which Rivoira derives from Lombardy. All four quoins of the nave are visible and exhibit

¹ Information kindly furnished by Dr Louis Cobbett of Cambridge.

² Willis and Clark, *Architectural History*, etc., Camb., 1886, I, 276.

l. and s. work. The chancel has been rebuilt, and arcades to aisles have been cut through the nave walls. 355, 406.

CAMBRIDGE, ST GILES, C³. A relic, Anglo-Saxon in style but of post-Conquest date, is preserved in the modern church of this name, in the form of an arch now built in at the E end of the S aisle. It comes from the older church of St Giles which is figured from an old print in Atkinson and Clark, *Cambridge Described and Illustrated*, p. 142, and as this older church had no tower the arch must have been that of the chancel, though in its present position it will be wrongly oriented, as the enriched side, which in a chancel arch is always on the W, is now turned to E. The forms and technique are in part distinctly Saxon, but the voussoirs are not through-stones. Dr Cobbett has kindly communicated an extract from a record which shows that the church of which this arch formed a part must have been built in or before 1092, a fact to be duly noted in connection with the Saxo-Norman overlap.

CANTERBURY, CHRIST CHURCH CATHEDRAL, Kent, A¹. No extant remains; buildings figured and described from literary sources, 76 f.*; lateral porches, 88, 109, 193, 296; lateral towers, 340. 63, 233, 320.

CANTERBURY, ST MARTIN, A¹, perhaps in part Romano-British, 76 {W part of chancel and nave} 80 f.*. Archway in W wall, 113; buttresses, 81, 84. 58, 63, 97, 239, 256, 280, 348, 384.

CANTERBURY, ST PANCRAS, A¹ {single-celled apsidal church built of Roman brick, with W porch and N and S side chapels, 85} 82 f.*. Buttresses, 84; Roman column base, 384*. 64, 76, 99 f., 135, 239, 256, 280, 329, 348.

CANTERBURY, ST PETER AND ST PAUL, Abbey Church of St Augustine, A¹ {main fabric}. Described and discussed, 86 f.**; church not basilican, 90; funereal arrangements, 88 f., 184. 64, 76, 135, 266, 348.

CANTERBURY, ST MILDRED, C³ {remarkable big stone quoins SW and SE of nave of Roman stones re-used}. 24* f., 94, 429.

Mr Cozens of Querns, Canterbury, Hon. Sec. of the local archaeological society, has called attention to the fact that in dimensions, thickness of walls, etc., St Mildred coincides almost exactly with two other Canterbury churches, St Dunstan and St Stephen, both of which are Norman. St Mildred, the nave walls of which are over 3 ft. thick, may have been built by the Normans but the quoins are undoubtedly Saxon survivals.

CARLTON IN LINDRICK, Notts, C³ {W tower}. Nave and chancel with later N and S aisles. Uppermost stage of tower with buttresses at the tower quoins are of XV, but the tower below the upper stage is XI, and there are

signs, chiefly apparent in the interior where shafts are still visible, that there was mid-wall work in the belfry openings that are now built up, 400.

The tower arch is Saxon but of late appearance, 400; it has a square hood mould, a roll on the E arris of the opening, and a soffit roll, 398 f., carried by shafts with capitals enriched with the upright oval forms called sometimes 'Jew's harp ornament,' that are probably degenerate survivals of erect leaves, 412; nave and chancel have traces of old internally splayed small Norman windows.

CAVERSFIELD, Oxon, C {W tower}. In the lower part of the N and S walls of the tower are two small double splayed windows with mid-wall slabs in which are cut r. h. apertures 6 in. wide, the extreme width of splay in inner face of wall being 2 ft. 6 in.

CHERITON, Kent, C {W wall (and side walls?) of nave}. The present tower has been built up against a Saxon W wall in which is preserved in the lower part a double splayed window with the opening nearer to the W face of the wall than to the E face; below the window is a tall narrow doorway that was once the W entrance to the pre-Conquest church.

CHICKNEY, Essex, C² or ³ {nave and W part of chancel}. A delightful little church out in the fields with an ample farm close by but no sign of a village. The W tower and E extension of chancel are later; no aisles; masonry flint rubble with no herring-bone technique; in the S wall of the nave is a well preserved double splayed window with traces of one opposite to it in the N wall; on each side of the chancel in its W part are the traces of double splayed windows. Dimensions, nave c. 31 ft. by 18 ft., Saxon chancel about 15 ft. square; chancel arch pointed.

[Cholsey, Berks, a well known Norman cruciform church, exhibits a curious Saxon survival in the form of l. and s. quoins at the angles of its central tower, as is explained in the text, 426.]

CLAPHAM, Beds., C² {Saxon W tower} with a later belfry stage that has recessed double openings; rest of church rebuilt. The tower is wider than the nave so that it may have formed the body of the church. The Saxon part of the tower rises perfectly plain and the walls are pierced with small r. h. double splayed windows; openings on the ground story not characteristic; and r. h. doorway opening into nave above tower arch.

CLAYDON, Suffolk, C {pre-Conquest nave with l. and s. quoins}; later W tower, transepts, and chancel.

CLAYTON, Sussex, C³ {nave-and-chancel church possessing in its chancel arch a pronounced pre-Conquest feature} 399*. Though there are no old openings in nave or chancel walls, and no l. and s. in the quoins or other

specially Saxon details, the whole fabric may be fairly put down as pre-Conquest. The quoins are of the big stone character but not strongly marked. The walls are about 2 ft. 4 in. thick.

CLEE, Lincs., C³, one of the 'Lincolnshire' towers with characteristic features such as the W doorway, 396*; the tower arch, 403; the 'keyhole' loop, 402*; cubical caps in the belfry openings, 411, Fig. 192 II. 22*, 35.

COLCHESTER, TRINITY CHURCH, Essex, C {a W tower constructed largely of Roman bricks}. Three superimposed bricks form the imposts of the tower arch, 280, which is turned in this material; in the tower is a double splayed window.

COLEBY, Lincs., on the Cliff Road, C³, a 'Lincolnshire' tower with two 'keyhole' windows, as at Clee, Lincs., and Langford, Oxon, 35, 402.

COLLINGHAM, Yorks., C. This Wharfedale church, well known from its possession of important carved stones and runic inscriptions, has very distinct l. and s. work on the SW quoin of the nave.

COLNEY, Norfolk, C³ {round W tower with double splayed lights}.

COLN ROGERS, Gloucestershire, C³ {a well preserved nave-and-chancel Saxon church with later additions}. Later W tower and S porch; nave with l. and s. quoins at all four angles; pre-Conquest chancel arch with enriched imposts, and voussoirs and jamb stones going through the thickness of the wall, which, without plaster, measures 2 ft. 2 in. The plastered nave walls are thicker; on both nave and chancel walls there are pilaster strips with stepped bases as at Langford, 281*, or at Bradford-on-Avon, both almost in the neighbourhood. The chancel arch is narrow, 6 ft. 3 in., and lofty, 10 ft. 8 in.; the nave 53 ft. 8 in. long by a width of 18 ft. 4 in. The chancel seems to have been lengthened towards E. 327, 405*.

COLTISHALL, Norfolk, C³. A square W tower, nave with S aisle, and chancel; in N wall of nave are two double splayed circular lights about 15 ft. from the ground.

CORBRIDGE, Northumberland, A² {W tower raised over earlier porch; nave about 48 ft. long by 17 ft. 8 in. wide and 29 ft. high}. Magnificent tower arch of Roman stones. Described and discussed, 142 f.**; gable cross, 290*; recent discoveries, 146. 109, 139, 193, 329, 373, 392.

CORHAMPTON, Hants, C³ {a complete Saxon nave-and-chancel church, with E end of chancel altered}. Good tall Saxon N door to nave with pilaster strip rising from above its crown, 240, and moulded imposts, 405*; plain Saxon chancel arch with strip-work round the opening; enriched Saxon sundial, 276*; original stone altar slab preserved in N wall of chancel; Saxon sundial, 15. The church was restored in 1905. 407.

GREAT CORRINGHAM, Lincs., C³, W tower of 'Lincolnshire' type with mid-wall work in the four belfry openings.

CRANWELL, Lincs., C. A small nave about 37 ft. by 16 ft. with fine Norman arcade to N aisle; small chancel rebuilt in 1904 when other alterations were made and four interesting stones with interlacing work were discovered; the E quoin of the N wall of the nave, 2 ft. 5 in. thick, showed l. and s. work but this is now concealed by the construction of an organ chamber.¹ One of the 'short' stones had knot-work carved upon it.

CRINGLEFORD, Norfolk, C. This church, near Norwich, holds some good carved stones; Saxon features are a double splayed r. h. light in the S wall of the nave, and another in the N wall of the chancel.

DAGLINGWORTH, Gloucestershire, C² or 3 {main fabric}. This well known example seems at first sight almost completely Saxon, but there has been a great deal of rebuilding, e.g., the chancel, in which however the old l. and s. quoins have been remade. The S wall of the nave is intact and has its original l. and s. quoins. The N aisle and the W tower are later and so is the S porch, for over the Saxon S door is a sundial, from which the porch would effectually keep the solar rays. Originally there was a cross wall cutting off a square at the W end of the nave, and the wall here is thickened for carrying an axial tower, 342, but all other traces are now removed.

When the chancel was reconstructed about 1850 there were discovered, built in, so that the flat backs of the panels formed the jambs of the chancel arch, some important sculptured slabs with figure subjects, now displayed on the N and S walls of the body of the church. Their original position is not known, so that they do not come into connection with the architecture of the building and are not noticed in this Volume. The same applies to a similar sculptured slab with the Mother and Child now built into the inner wall of the outer porch at Deerhurst, 210. A Saxon sundial, 15. 296, 310, 340, 342, 373, 405*.

[Darsham, Suffolk. This church, on the list in the first edition, is now withdrawn, as a renewed examination convinces the writer that the indications of l. and s. work on the quoins are too uncertain.]

DEBENHAM, Suffolk, C {lower part of the W tower}. This is a fine specimen of Anglo-Saxon work, perhaps the best in the county. The NW quoin of the tower is in good l. and s. work up to the top of the first stage, a height of about 20 ft., but on the SW quoin the l. and s. work ends sooner. Dr Louis Cobbett, who has been good enough to report on the church, shows

¹ Information kindly furnished by the Vicar, Rev. W. Harrington, M.A.

reason for thinking that the small r. h. light on the S face in this first stage was once a double splayed window but was altered by the Normans to its present form. The plain tower arch, a little horseshoed, appears Norman but above it, now built up all but a narrow slit, is one of the doorways cut straight through the wall that the reader will know so well.

DEERHURST CHURCH, Gloucestershire, B³, 205 f. It is enough to refer to the text for the description and discussion of this exceptionally important and interesting example, here ascribed to the earlier half of X. There are indications of the influence of Norse decorative forms, 206, and the arrangements of the great W tower are of exceptional elaboration; Saxon font, 15, 211*. There are seven illustrations in the text, Figs. 81 to 87. *Passim*.

DEERHURST CHAPEL, *ibid.*, C³ {main fabric}. As a datable example within a few years of the Conquest, and as a capella coexisting in the same place with a church, the building is very noteworthy. It is figured and described in the text, 307 f.*. 9, 17, 31, 405*.

DELBURY or DIDDLEBURY, Salop, C³ {nave}. The church has marked Saxon features combined with added ones of Norman origin. Axial tower, 342; nave substantially Saxon. The N wall has a characteristic pre-Conquest doorway, 26, and double splayed window, 245*. A veneer of Norman herring-bone work has been applied to the interior of the N wall, 245*. 342.

DOVER, ST MARY-IN-THE-CASTLE, Kent, C¹ {a complete cruciform large aisleless Saxon church}. For description and discussion refer to text, 353**. Baluster shafts, 265*. 350, 384.

DUNFERMLINE, Fife, Scotland. It was noted in the text, 17, that though examples of regular Saxon architecture are not found further N than Northumberland yet the Saxo-Norman overlap has at any rate left its traces at St Regulus', St Andrews; and Restennet, Forfarshire, while Dunfermline seems to provide an exception to the general principle just laid down. The reference is to discoveries under the floor of the present nave of Dunfermline Abbey church, carried out under the direction of the Ancient Monument Department of the Scottish Office of Works, in the first instance by Dr Macgregor Chalmers, the well known architect and antiquary of Glasgow. In 1916 Dr Chalmers laid bare the ground under the present pavement of the nave and exposed to view foundations and lower courses of walling of earlier dates, and since then all that has come to light has been carefully scrutinized and plotted by the Office, under Mr J. Wilson Paterson, M.B.E., A.R.I.B.A. The writer is kindly allowed to utilize the unpublished plan of the exca-

ventions, and Fig. 205 gives that small portion of it that has special significance for the students of Saxon architecture. Traces of older buildings with an apsidal termination occupy nearly the whole length of the present nave, but in the W part there are indications of a structure of small dimensions and of quite a Saxon form, such as the Saxon princess Margaret, who married Malcolm Canmore and came to Dunfermline soon after the Norman Conquest, might well have had set up. It consisted, it will be seen, of a W tower and very small E adjunct that we may call nave or altar house. The more extensive structures which continue towards E have been ignored in Fig. 205, and only that shown which has just been described. The broken lines




FIG. 205, Plan of part of excavations in the nave of Dunfermline Abbey Church, showing a possible Saxon church.

give the probable outline of the foundations of the structure and the stones found are shown in their places. To N and S there are indicated by their corners the outlines of the square plinths of the present columns of the Norman nave. To judge from the foundations the tower may have been externally about 20 ft. square, and the nave measured internally about 20 ft. by 14 ft. 327.

DUNHAM MAGNA, Norfolk, C³ {Saxo-Norman church, Saxon in scheme and Norman in many details} 346*. Comparison of its decorative arcading with that at Bradford-on-Avon, 301*; base of mid-wall shaft, Fig. 194 e. 22*, 280, 348, 353, 373, 384.

EARLS BARTON, Northamptonshire, C¹ {W tower}. The finest existing

example of Anglo-Saxon architecture. Described and discussed, 283****, 35, 187, 198, 215, 240, 242, 257, 262, 271, 337 f.

EDGEWORTH, Gloucestershire, C³ {a blocked N doorway of Cotswold type with jambs constructed Escomb fashion and a flat lintel}.

N ELMHAM, Norfolk, C¹, an enigmatical example with only the plan preserved, 343. Crux Commissa scheme with apse and transept; aisleless nave with lateral adjuncts; W axial tower; half-round stair turret. 339, 373.

ESCOMB, Durham, A² {complete early nave-and-chancel Saxon church}. Described and discussed, 136 f.*****; chancel arch, 53 f.*. 11, 15, 20, 30, 72, 133, 178, 222, 327, 329, 359.

FAREHAM, Hants, C. The ancient chancel of this curious secular-looking XVIII edifice shows distinct Saxon marks. It is of the normal size for a Saxon nave and measures 43 ft. in length by 17 ft. 9 in. in width. The E half of the N wall has its lower part to a height of about 4 ft. constructed of irregular rubble masonry of Saxon character, and, what is more important, there is distinct l. and s. masonry on the NE quoin, while the E wall exhibits also Saxon rubble to the height before indicated.

The building seems too large to have been originally a chancel, and if it were a nave we should look for signs in the E wall for a break indicating the start of a chancel, but the Saxon masonry seems here unbroken.

[Fetcham, Surrey, Norman, see 440.]

FORNCETT ST PETER, Norfolk, C³. A round W tower with mid-wall work in the openings facing the cardinal points, but Norman caps and bases to the mid-wall shafts; on the lower levels of the tower are circular double splayed lights. Tower arch like St Peter-at-Gowts, Lincoln. 403, 423.

GEDDINGTON, Northants, C {Saxon nave}. This beautiful church, which overlooks the exquisite triangular Eleanor Cross now in these motoring days once more well known, would not be suspected of Saxon affinities did not there exist on the N, originally exterior, wall of the nave in its upper part, above the Late Norman arcade and now seen from the N aisle, a range of decorative arcading with straight sided arches that is clearly of Saxon date. The external opening of a blocked window is visible within one of the arches and on the inner or S face of the wall there are or were indications in the plastering of the wide internal splay. The fabric of the nave is clearly Saxon, and it measured 37 ft. in length by a width of 18 ft. 9 in. and a height of about 30 ft. The N and S walls are 2 ft. 7 in. thick. The decorative arcade is formed of flat strips about 5 in. wide, 242.

The Vicar, the Rev. B. Turton, M.A., has been good enough to report that 'by the removal of modern stucco the remains of Anglo-Saxon work have been more clearly revealed.'

GISSING, Norfolk, C³, a round W tower with Norman tower arch, but with mid-wall shafts in the belfry openings, and a small double splayed circular window W of the tower. 423.

GLENTWORTH, Lincs., C³, a typical 'Lincolnshire' W tower, with remarkable caps in the belfry openings. Normanlike details occur though the general character of the work is pre-Conquest. One small detail of interest noticed in a paper on the church by Mr C. Hodgson Fowler in *Ass. Soc. Reports*, Vol. xiv, is the mark on the shaft of the W belfry opening of the mechanism by which a bell had been hung in the opening, 'in the manner,' Mr Fowler says, 'commonly seen in the ordinary campaniles of Italy, buildings of much the same date as this tower.' 407; 413, 442.

GODALMING, Surrey, C. The kernel of this now extended building is Saxon. 'The east half of the present nave represents the nave of the pre-Conquest church, and the central tower is on the site of its chancel,'¹ 347. The walls of the nave are pierced with later arcades. The E wall of the nave contained a round headed chancel arch replaced by Sir Gilbert Scott by a pointed one, and the gable of this E wall was incorporated in the W wall of the later Norman, now central, tower. In this gable the interesting discovery was made a few years ago of two small double splayed circular openings with apertures of about 6 in. They were above the roof of the Saxon chancel and were intended either to admit light and air to a chamber above the flat inner roof of the Saxon nave, or, as Mr Thackeray Turner in a letter to the local paper opined, to ventilate and so preserve from decay the timbers of the roof. These openings are now accessible though with some difficulty from the belfry, 337.

GOSBECK, Suffolk, C, has nave and chancel and a tower to SW the lower story of which serves as a porch. Saxon features are l. and s. quoins at the E end of the nave and a double splayed r. h. light in the N wall.

GREENS NORTON, Northamptonshire, C {nave}. A fine spacious church possessing now W tower, nave with aisles, and chancel. The nave is Saxon and at all the four corners of it excellent l. and s. quoins are preserved. The walls are 2 ft. 8 in. thick and of remarkable height, and are constructed of rubble work of Saxon character. There are no original windows, but there is a curious opening now blocked in the E gable of the nave with monolithic

¹ Col. H. L. Jessep, *Notes on pre-Conquest Church Architecture in Hampshire and Surrey*, Winchester, 1913.

jambs and a triangular head, perhaps connected with a chamber in the roof. Cf. Godalming, above.

GREENSTEAD, Essex, C². Of this unique timber church of about 1015 a full account is given in the text, 39 f.**. 198, 306.

GUILDFORD, Surrey, C {tower}. Here the handsome central tower is Saxon and was originally either a W tower, or an axial tower between nave and chancel. This is proved by the existence of pilaster strips on the exterior, four on the W face and four on the three other faces, of which those to N and S must have been originally external for they appear now in the interior, where later Norman N and S tower arches communicate with lateral extensions of the church. Between the pilaster strips on these faces there are old double splayed lights cut into by the N and S arches just mentioned. The present church is largely Norman and Early English, and has aisled nave and vaulted chancel with aisles of which that to N ends apsidally and is vaulted, with remains of mediaeval painting on the fields. 347.

HACKNESS, Yorks., B¹ {nave}. An Early Saxon nave with interesting carving on the N impost of the chancel arch; noticed in text, 203 f.*.

HADDISCOE, Norfolk, C³, a round W tower with mid-wall work in the double belfry openings but distinctly Norman detail. A rich Norman S door admits to the nave to which the ground story of the tower opens by a tall and narrow tower arch with plain chamfered imposts, above which is the familiar r. h. doorway opening towards the nave. Externally the late detail of the belfry openings is very apparent. The caps are fully developed cubical ones of the scalloped type and the jambs of the openings are furnished with angle shafts. The subsidiary arches have straight sided heads. The billet moulding is in evidence but not the later chevron. On the billet moulding see 433. 422 f.

HADSTOCK, Essex, C² {nave}, 365***. 255, 306, 327, 407 f.

HAINTON, Lincolnshire, C³, a W tower of the local type rising from a bold plinth of two square orders, 22*; the W corner buttresses are later additions; the lower stage of the tower shows early rubble masonry with wide joints and has on the S face a keyhole opening.

GREAT HALE, Lincolnshire, C³ {W tower}. The extreme plainness of this characteristic tower of its class, unbroken as it is by any string course or set-off, makes it at first sight look decidedly primitive, but an examination shows that it is really of post-Conquest date. The tower arch in wall 4 ft. thick is plain with chamfered imposts; jambs and voussoirs show Norman technique; a unique winding stair in the NE angle, 339*; an interesting set of caps in the belfry openings, 413, Fig. 192, nos. XII to XV.

[Great Hallingbury, Essex, almost entirely rebuilt. The chancel arch, 11 ft. 6 in. wide in wall 3 ft. 5 in. thick, is constructed entirely, including jambs and imposts, of Roman brick. Arch and jambs once recessed in two square orders on W. There are no Saxon signs and the Monument Commission dates it late XI. These arches in Roman brick are not necessarily pre-Conquest. There is one at Tollesbury, Essex, that is certainly not Saxon.]

LOWER HALSTOW, Kent, C³ {part of chancel}, a small church built of flint rubble with Roman brick. The S wall of the chancel seems in its W part to be Saxon. There is in it an old built-up light with external aperture c. 9 in. in width and 3 ft. 7 in. high with head carelessly turned in Roman brick bungled at the crown, Tredington fashion, 426. The wall here is c. 1 ft. 5 in. thick, but the chancel has been lengthened, and for the last 10 ft. towards the SE corner the thickness is greater by 2 or 3 in. The W part of this S wall is in all probability pre-Conquest. There is a fine old figured leaden font that came to light under a coat of plaster in 1921.

HAMBLEDON, Hants, C {nave}. This church, of the birthplace of cricket, is of considerable architectural interest, but the only part that concerns us is the W portion of the present nave. This was described to the writer in a kind communication from the late R. Phené Spiers. The Saxon part consists in the three W bays of the nave, forming a nave 37 ft. long by 18 ft. 6 in. wide, E of which was a chancel c. 13 ft. 6 in. wide, that still remains but forms now an extension of the nave, a new chancel having been formed beyond. The Saxon nave walls, 2 ft. 6 in. thick, are pierced through by arcades of XII, but the walls above the arches, seen from the N and S aisles show four pilaster strips about 8 in. wide with a projection of 2 in. Two old int. splayed windows are built in at the W ends of the XII aisles, but they have no specially Saxon character.

[West Hampnett, Sussex. This church belongs to rather a large class, represented numerously in the coastal strip between the Downs and the sea from Worthing to Chichester, by Ford, Rumboldswyke, Eastergate, Tangmere, Lyminster, Walberton, etc., as well as in other parts of the county, as at Friston and Eastdean at the back of Beachy Head, Hangleton, Ovingdean, Rottingdean, etc., near Brighton. Mr Philip Mainwaring Johnston is the great expert on these Sussex examples, see his paper in *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, Vol. XLIII, 1900, with a note on it by the Rev. Canon Greville M. Livett in the same series Vol. XLVIII, 40, where Mr Johnston's list is criticized as too inclusive. None of the churches in the class referred to have any distinctive Anglo-Saxon feature, but may all be reckoned to date within about a half-century after the Conquest. On the other hand in some cases, e.g. Poling, churches of essentially the same general character will have

a double splayed window, a l. and s. quoin, or pilaster strips, and they of course have to be included, while examples such as West Hampnett, Ford, etc., are omitted because there is nothing specially Saxon about them.]

HARDWICKE, Bucks, C {nave ?}. This handsome church of ample dimensions, a few miles N of Aylesbury, possesses a nave pronounced by the Monument Commissioners to be 'probably of pre-Conquest date.' In favour of this is the existence over the N door of the nave of a double splayed window with the glass about in the middle thickness of the wall. High up in the S wall above the arcade communicating with a S aisle is a small int. splayed circular light filled in on its outer face with quatrefoil tracery, with the traces of a similar opening further to W. The Commissioners attribute this to XIV, but with Arreton in our minds we would be inclined to restrict this date to the tracery, and make the light an original upper opening of the Saxon nave similar to the openings at Arreton, Avebury, 37*, Barton-on-Humber, 289, Bosham, Fig. 203. If the nave be Saxon it is a fine bit of work, for it measures nearly 65 ft. by 23 ft. and is very lofty. The side walls are however 3 ft. 3 or 4 in. thick, which is not quite Saxon.

HARMSTON, Lincs., C³ {W tower}, a tower looking rather late in its class, but exhibiting the normal belfry openings with mid-wall work.

HARPSWELL, Lincs., C³, a very massive W tower, 21 ft. 6 in. square and of Norman rather than Saxon proportions. It has a moulded plinth with undercutting of an advanced type but the double belfry openings are of the orthodox 'Lincolnshire' type.

HART, Durham, A³ or B {nave, baluster shafts}. This is a church of ecclesiastical importance, the centre of the district inland from Hartlepool called by Symeon of Durham, *Hist. Reg.*, ad ann. 854, 'Heorternysse' and afterwards 'Hartness.' The church of Hart is the mother church of Hartlepool (Vol. v, p. 75), but both place and church are now of small moment, though Father Haigh thought this the site of Hrothgar's Hall celebrated in Beowulf! The present church of Hart preserves its Saxon nave, the side walls of which have been pierced by later arcades, above which on N are the remains of an original window. In the W wall there is a later Norman arch leading from the square W tower, but in the E wall over the more recent chancel arch are the remains of an earlier arch and also a blocked window-opening with a triangular head. There is no specially Saxon character about the rubble masonry or the quoins, but the early date that Mr Hodges ascribed to the nave walls seems justified, and is enforced by the presence in the church of two lathe-turned baluster shafts of the Monkwearmouth-Jarrow type, which might be held to put the original church back into VII. 258.




FIG. 206, SE quoin of Saxon nave, Heddon-on-the-Wall.

HEADBORNE WORTHY, Hants, C³ {main fabric}. This picturesque and antique-looking edifice has preserved its Saxon nave and the SW portion of its Saxon chancel where on the S wall is a pilaster strip. There are three pilaster strips on the N wall of the nave and 1. and s. work on its NE quoin. Against the W wall of the nave there was built up in XV a W adjunct, and within this is seen on the ground level the original Saxon W door of the nave, with jambs constructed Escomb fashion, plain imposts, and an arch with two square orders. It is 7 ft. 6 in. high and 3 ft. wide. Above this doorway are the remains of a carved Rood, seen from an upper floor in the W adjunct, but the sculpture has been cut down flush with the wall, as was also the case at Breamore, Hants, 351.

HEAPHAM, Lincs., C³ {W tower}. Mid-wall work in belfry openings (corner buttresses are modern); W door partly preserved with flat lintel and filled-in tympanum above; higher up a keyhole loop as at Clee.

HEDDON-ON-THE-WALL, Northumberland, B or C¹. Here some 1. and s. quoining on the SE angle of the nave is the sole Saxon survival in a church remarkable for fine Norman work especially in the vaulted chancel.

The church was recently described by Mr C. C. Hodges, in the *Proceedings* of the Soc. of Ant. of Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1924, and he claims for it a date early enough to bring it into connection with churches like Escomb and Corbridge. The great difficulty here is the 1. and s. quoin, as we have seen that this feature characterizes the Third Period churches,

and is conspicuously absent from the earlier group of monuments, 256. It is there noted that Heddon-on-the-Wall may present an early example of it, showing it as it were 'in the making.' The work cannot be properly investigated as the S wall of the chancel comes too close to the S quoin of the nave for the full size of all the large quoin stones to be seen, the chancel wall covering the N extremities of the alternate stones that grip into the wall, though the upright pillar-like stones are fully displayed. The drawing, Fig. 206, shows the arrangement, the vertical line on the sinister side being that of the chancel wall as it abuts on the E wall of the nave. S of the quoin comes the wall of the later S aisle set back a little from it. There are five large quoin stones, and the first, third, and fifth are partly concealed by the chancel wall, though they do not look as if they went much further in, but whether or not they would present in their full latitudinal extension the normal contrast to the pillar-like stones with which they alternate, see Figs. 6 and 31, it is obvious that they are abnormal in their vertical dimension, for they do not differ in height from the pillar stones, and the work could not be called 'long and short.' It has been noticed on 101 that large upright pillar-like stones are used on quoins as early as St Peter-on-the-Wall, in Essex, though without any sign of the alternating flat bonding stones, and it is possible that in this abnormal Heddon quoin we see this alternation in an early tentative stage. Mr Hodges is no doubt right in discerning the original aisleless Saxon nave-and-chancel church within the present extended interior.

[Helpston, Northants, near Peterborough, displayed some l. and s. work at the base of the W tower when this was under repair, but nothing of the kind is now in evidence.]

HEMMINGSTONE, Suffolk, C. Saxon l. and s. work survives here on the SW quoin of the nave.

HERRINGFLEET, Suffolk, C³. What was said of Haddiscoe applies here. The mid-wall work in the belfry openings of the round W tower is of Saxon tradition but the details are of Norman character. In addition to angle shafts and cubical capitals the billet moulding plays a considerable part in the rather lavish enrichment, 433. On the other hand the small openings on each side of the mid-wall shaft have triangular heads.

HEXHAM, Northumberland, see Chapter vi, and *passim*.

HEYSHAM CHURCH, } Lancashire, B¹?, are discussed and figured in the
HEYSHAM CHAPEL, } text, 187 f.**. 17, 30, 206, 309, 327.

HINTON AMPNER, Hants, C {nave}. The Saxon survivals here are fragmentary but sufficient to establish the pre-Conquest character of the nave. There is a pilaster strip on the N and one on the S wall of the nave

and a characteristic Saxon S door. L. and s. work survives on the NE quoin of nave.

HOLTON-LE-CLAY, Lincs., C³, an unimportant 'Lincolnshire' W tower with later top story; there is a good tall tower arch.

HOUGH-ON-THE-HILL, Lincolnshire, C¹. The only pre-Conquest portion is the lower two-thirds of the square W tower to which is attached a half-round stair turret, as at Brixworth, Brigstock, and Broughton. The church and the uppermost portion of the tower are much later but the pre-Conquest part is thoroughly Saxon and archaic-looking, and the small lights both r. h. and circular are framed with half-round mouldings strikingly like what are found in some early Irish oratories figured in Lord Dunraven's well known book. Mr Hamilton Thompson's suggestion about the plan is noticed, 295. 339.

HOUGHTON-ON-THE-HILL, Norfolk, C, a small nave-and-chancel church, with, in the nave, marks of antiquity in the external quoins and double splayed windows in the N and S walls, that on the N wall preserving its old wooden shutter in the mid-wall opening, 35.

HOFINGHAM, Yorkshire, C³, a square W tower of the class so largely represented, that combines with the familiar pre-Conquest features indications of a construction, or perhaps a re-construction in XII. It has a W door of quite advanced character, quoin stones set Stow fashion, mid-wall work in the belfry openings, and an extraordinary number of carved or moulded stones re-used in the walling. A remarkable piece of relief sculpture is built up into the S wall at a height too great for proper examination and should be taken out and brought into the church, when its date and character could be properly discussed in connection with similar work elsewhere, as on the 'Hedda' shrine at Peterborough.

HOWE, Norfolk, C³, a characteristic Norfolk round-towered nave-and-chancel church. There is a good tower arch, see Fig. 191 D, with arch set back 3 in. on the jambs. Double splayed lights in nave and tower. 36, 423.

INWORTH, Essex, C³ {main fabric}, a pleasantly situated little church, bears unmistakable Saxon evidence in two double splayed windows one on each side of the chancel. This has been lengthened eastwards, but the W part of it, with the chancel arch and the nave, probably date about the middle of XI. The walling, of flint rubble and puddingstone, is about 3 ft. thick.

IVER, Bucks, C³ {nave}. The spacious nave, 50 ft. by 21 ft., of this handsome church, on which E. A. Freeman has written,¹ would not be suspected of

¹ *Arch. Journ.*, vii, 147.

pre-Conquest ancestry were it not for the fortunate preservation of a portion of a double splayed Saxon window in the N wall cut into by a later arcade. The wall is 2 ft. 9 in. thick. It may perhaps be permitted to quote what is said of it in the Report by the Commission on Ancient Monuments,—‘part of a pre-Conquest window, with double splayed jambs and semicircular head; it shows on both sides of the wall, and is of roughly-axed hard limestone, which, on the S side, has a red tinge, apparently caused by fire.’¹ To this it must be added that the manner in which, as shown in Fig. 207, the archivolt mouldings are stopped on the jamb can be paralleled so very closely in an Early Norman doorway at St Nicholas, Caen, that Iver must be put down to a rather advanced date in XI.




FIG. 207. Blocked window in nave of Iver Church, Bucks.

JARROW, Durham, A¹, is treated in the text, 133 f.; tower, 130, 420; corbel cap, Fig. 98 iv. 20, 30, 120, 129, 202, 248, 258.

JEVINGTON, Sussex, C³ {W tower and nave}. This beautifully situated church, on the N slope of the S downs near Polegate, possesses a singularly massive and rather low W tower with an interior space 18 ft. square opening towards the nave by an interesting tower arch which is now flanked by two openings pierced in 1873, when the church was subjected to a drastic process of ‘restoration.’ The writer is indebted to the Rev. W. Budgen, M.A., of Eastbourne, for valuable information in writing and in a print about the edifice, the oldest portion of which, the W tower, is partly Saxon though its proportions and the details of its original belfry openings are Norman. There is an old drawing of the tower in 1804 which shows that these last had the normal mid-wall work but with the angle shafts of Norman tradition. The openings were entirely reconstructed in 1873 and are now honoured with a pointed arch that encloses them! but the mid-wall shafts were evidently re-used for they are banded balusters lathe-turned like the St Albans group that we have seen reason to regard, 264 f., as of Late Saxon origin. In the lower part of the tower there are traces in the N and S walls of the heads of small windows turned in Roman bricks, that by the dimensions of their apertures can be judged to have been double splayed. The tower arch, which is horseshoe shaped and 5 ft. 8 in. wide in a wall 2 ft. 1 in.

¹ Buckinghamshire, South, 219.

thick, was much cut about in 1873, but the jambs are in unmistakable Escomb technique, and on the W face there is strip-work round the opening. A remarkable sculptured slab found in the tower in 1785 is built in over the S door of the nave, and though it is not part of the architecture of the church it carries a useful indication of pre-Conquest date. The figure that fills the relief, a Christ nude save for the loin cloth, has below it on the sinister side a convoluted dragon that is worked with the contour lines of old Germanic tradition, that we do not find in Norman work.

KILPECK, Herefordshire, C {l. and s. quoin}. At the NE corner of the nave of this well known and remarkable Norman church are the remains of the l. and s. quoin of its Saxon predecessor.

KINGSBURY, Middlesex, C {main fabric}. This is a very old church¹ that has retained at any rate till recent days its rural character. The N and S walls of the church, 2 ft. 5 in. thick, are built of rubble and flint with an admixture of Roman brick, and l. and s. work is very distinct at the two W quoins, and also at the lower part of the NE quoin. There is an old doorway, 8 ft. 10 in. high, now disused, in the S wall, nave and chancel are structurally one, and the building measures internally 59 ft. by 18 ft.

KIRK HAMMERTON, Yorkshire, C³ {S part}. A well illustrated little brochure,² partly by Mr Hamilton Thompson, gives what is known about the church and what can be seen there. 'The present building consists of a south aisle and chapel, which formed the nave and chancel of the mediaeval church, and have the tower at their west end, and a modern nave, chancel and north aisle, which were added in 1891. The south aisle, chapel and tower are of the highest interest.' The preservation of the whole of the chancel, which *may* with the tower be a little later than the nave, is important as Saxon chancels have generally been added to. The chancel arch preserved on the S side (the N is rebuilt) is once recessed above two superimposed square impost blocks. Near the springing large stones are cut to the curve of the arch after the fashion described on 68, and the whole shows a blundering attempt to reproduce the properly membered archways which advanced Romanesque was bringing into vogue. The walls are high and the proportions Saxon, and the tower has plain mid-wall work. The church is still quite Saxon but must date very near to the Conquest. There are no double splayed windows, or quoins of specially Saxon character, but

¹ *Old Kingsbury Church*, Lond., 'Home Words,' 11 Ludgate Square, 1920, gives the history of the church, but there is no plan.

² *The Church of St John the Baptist, Kirk Hammerton, York*, N. Smith, no. 5, St Stephen's House, Westminster, 1911.

very large stones are used in parts, and there is strip-work round the opening of the S doorway, but no independent pilaster strips. The new church to N was built in 1891 by Mr Hodgson Fowler. 397*.

KIRBY HILL (Kirkby-on-the-Moor), Yorkshire, near Boroughbridge, B. The fabric of the nave is probably Saxon. A date is indicated for perhaps IX by a carved 'Anglian' enrichment on the original E impost of the S door, 205. The brochure mentioned below¹ gives a full history, but the chronological evidence of the impost is missed.

KIRKDALE, Yorkshire, C³ {nave}. The only strictly architectural feature about this plain but extremely important little church,² just at the foot of the Yorkshire Moors, is the original W doorway now the tower arch, Fig. 184. Of the sundial over the S door which gives the church its date and its exceptional value enough has been said, Vol. 1, p. 356. The nave is no doubt all of the date indicated, but the W tower and chancel are modern. The most northerly pilaster strip known ran originally up the W gable, 307 f. 243, 379, 397*.

LANGFORD, Oxfordshire, C³. For those interested in the antiquarian side of architecture few English village churches can be more attractive. It has been more than once referred to in the text for the Saxon features in its axial tower, 35, 243, 281*; for the advanced belfry openings in the same tower, 415; for the treatment of the interior arches of the tower with their cylindrical caps and soffit rolls, 399, 415*. There are also interesting fragments of sculpture not architecturally significant. The acanthus foliage enriching the belfry openings, the shafts in which, not properly angle shafts, are so ungrammatically treated, and other abnormal appearances would well repay investigation. It cannot, strictly speaking, be said to illustrate the Saxo-Norman overlap, for the advanced features are not characteristically Norman. 255, 327, 340, 346, 429, 433.

LAUGHTON-EN-LE-MORTHEN, Yorkshire, near Rotherham, C. Like Kilpeck and like Earls Barton, this church stands just outside the enclosure of an Early Norman mote-and-bailey earthwork. It is a fine church and has a small Saxon survival in the form of an old N doorway at the W end of the present N aisle. This has strip-work round the opening and pilaster strips.

LAVENDON, Bucks, C³ {main fabric}. W tower, aisled nave and chancel, all except the nave aisles and the E part of the chancel apparently pre-Conquest.

¹ *The Church of All Saints, Kirkby-on-the-Moor*, by H. Stapleton, M.A., vicar, Leeds, John Whitehead and Sons, 1923.

² *Saint Gregory's Minster, Kirkdale*, Rev. W. F. Powell, Leeds, Beck, 1909.

So at any rate the Monument Commissioners, though there is a curious absence of any definitely Saxon marks except perhaps the faulty placing, Tredington fashion, of the upper arch stones in the small window S of the tower. The old nave window cut into by the later N arcade is properly worked. The wall here is 2 ft. 6½ in. thick without the plastering, 426. 245.

LAVERSTOKE, Hants, C. The old church of this place (not to be confounded with the new one in the village) is situated in the park a little E of Laverstoke House, and is now the mausoleum of the Portal family. The NE quoin of the nave is in good l. and s. work and dates this at any rate as Saxon.

LEDSSHAM, Yorkshire, near Leeds, C³ {lower part of W tower, nave}. We have here a Late Saxon nave and W tower with some Norman details, and a remarkable band of carving round the S doorway into the tower. The tower, measuring internally 12 ft. 3 in. E to W by about 9 ft. 8 in. N to S, see 193, has thin walls of about 2 ft. 2 in. or 2 ft. 3 in., but a tower arch that has the Norman feature of an impost with a quirked chamfer. There is the usual E doorway over it. The upper part of the tower is later and the form of the original belfry openings cannot be determined. The S door of the tower is the feature of chief interest in the building. There is a plain archway with some very loose interlacing work on the E impost, with a use of round pellets for filling which is a late feature. The archway is surrounded by a projecting moulding square in section with the face of it enriched with a rather debased conventional vine scroll carved without sharpness or emphasis and using also the round pellet. The work, which seems to have been renewed, is essentially the same in design as the bands round the Deerhurst font of about X, but this need not drive the date of Ledsham back, as the vine scroll has a very long life-history.

The nave of the church measures inside 45 ft. 8 in. by 17 ft. 3 in. with walls about 2 ft. 4 or 5 in. thick, and was well supplied with original windows of which there are four high up in the S wall while there are traces of a similar row on N. These windows are singularly large for a Late Saxon or Early Norman church, where as a rule the apertures tend to become narrow slits. The SW one has an external aperture 1 ft. 10 in. wide, and is splayed internally to 3 ft. 3 in. with a height of 6 ft. 6 in. The chancel arch is also early though the details, as on the S doorway of the tower, appear renewed. Altogether the church is of remarkable interest.¹

LEEDS, Kent, C {nave}. In this church, notable for its extremely massive low Norman W tower, measuring 34 ft. 6 in. N to S by 31 ft. 9 in. E to W

¹ Notes on the church by Mr John Bilson have been of much value.

and built with a large use of tufa, there are old nave windows, double splayed, with fragments of mid-wall planking still remaining, 35. These windows were revealed in 1879 by the removal of successive coatings of plaster and whitewash, and show that the present nave walls are those of a Saxon nave only a little shorter eastwards than it is now. Chancel and aisles are of course later.

LEICESTER, ST NICHOLAS, C, close by the Roman 'Jewry Wall,' probably the W gate of Ratac. The rubble built walls of the nave, 3 ft. thick, are pre-Conquest, and above the Norman arcade in the N wall are the remains of two r. h. double splayed lights with their heads partly turned in Roman brick. The nave walls are lofty and show Saxon character in their W quoins. It is noteworthy that the church is built where it would block access to the gate of the Roman city, showing that this had gone out of use.

[Leonard Stanley, Gloucestershire. In *Archaeologia*, LXXI, 1921, p. 222 f., the small chapel here, now used as a barn, is claimed as of Saxon fabric, but an examination of it in conjunction with Mr St Clair Baddeley of Painswick led to the conclusion that there was nothing earlier than Norman times visible. There is a good deal of herring-bone work in the walls which are 2 ft. 8 in. thick, while the excavated apse, figured in *Archaeologia* but not now visible, is in very Norman-looking herring-bone masonry.]

LEWES, ST JOHN-SUB-CASTRO, Sussex, C. Here a remnant of an early church is incorporated with the flint rubble fabric of a modern edifice in the outer wall of an organ chamber to N of the chancel. It is a doorway but only the outer face of it is preserved. The opening 3 ft. 3 in. wide is framed with three narrow half-round pilasters on each jamb, to which correspond flatter half rolls round the archivolt. Between come the imposts, in the form of what looks like a square sectioned string course marked with two horizontal grooves that seems to have been continued along the wall to the right and left of the doorway. The whole feature is very peculiar, but the triple mouldings reappear in a very similar form round the admittedly Saxon chancel arch at Strethall, Essex, 481.

EAST LEXHAM, Norfolk, C. When the first edition appeared the tower and W part of the nave were mantled in a luxuriant growth of ivy. This was cleared away in 1916 by the present vicar, the Rev. T. M. Tunnard, who has kindly reported that the removal did not bring to light any new features of interest. There is a round W tower, a nave and chancel structurally one, and a S porch. The quoins, especially that on SE, are in the l. and s. technique but not consistently carried out. The W tower is interesting. It has r. h. belfry openings to E, SW, and NW. That to E is filled in with a stone slab or transenna, 35, pierced with apertures that leave the slab in the

form of a cross patty of early design. The other two openings have mid-wall shafts, one on NW a baluster of bellying shape with a square cap, the other a made-up pillar of rubble, 443, 446. Through-stones were probably in the region not procurable, so the arch of the opening is splayed down towards the centre in rule-of-thumb fashion. 263, 423.

LIMPLEY STOKE, Wilts, near Bradford-on-Avon, C¹? {doorway in nave}.

This little church, high up on the down above the Avon, has a Saxon nave 32 ft. 6 in. by 13 ft. 6 in. with walls of good stonework 2 ft. 3 in. thick, a later chancel, and a W tower with walls 2 ft. 8 in. thick that is probably later than the nave, but has like it very well cut ashlar quoins of large stones set Stow fashion, one at the NW quoin of the tower measuring 5 ft. by 1 ft. 3 in. Internally there is preserved, in the S wall cut through by later arches of two periods, a wonderful S doorway. Its narrowness, 303, is its most marked quality, for it is only 2 ft. 5 in. wide by a height of 8 ft. 9 in. The jambs are almost monolithic for one stone on the W jamb is 4 ft. 8 in. high by a width of 2 ft. 5 in., the same as the substance of the wall, and a thickness of 10 in. The voussoirs are all through-stones, and the opening was cut straight through the wall, though later on a rebate 4½ in. deep was cut on the N side for the door. The imposts are hollow chamfered, but there is the curious feature that a roll is worked on each arris as in the W doorway of the early porch at Monkwearmouth, though the work at Limpley Stoke is more accentuated. Finally there is the remarkable feature that the arch is most distinctly horseshoed, and as a quite assuredly Saxon example of this feature it must be almost unique. It does not look here like a kind of stiling, as is sometimes its appearance, but is deliberate, as the stones are carefully shaped. 30, 70.

LINCOLN, ST BENEDICT, C³, is a 'Lincolnshire' tower with mid-wall work but no caps, and there are no other signs of Saxon features or technique in the very picturesque old building. See below, and St Peter-at-Gowts.

LINCOLN, ST MARY-LE-WIGFORD, close to the station, C³. The W tower here stands with that of the neighbouring St Peter-at-Gowts for the classic expression of the 'Lincolnshire' tower type, and it is curious that the third existing Lincoln example mentioned just above is in shape quite different, for it has rather the squat Norman form, while St Mary and St Peter are in a marked measure élancées. What is said in the text about St Peter-at-Gowts, 388 f., may be taken to apply in all but details to St Mary, but the nave of the latter is not like that of the former furnished with l. and s. quoins. A detail of special interest is the dedication inscription in Old English on part of a Roman inscribed stone built into the W face of the tower. It was ably dealt with in a short paper by the Rev. Prebendary


Wordsworth in *Ass. Soc. Reports*, xv, 1879, p. 16, and on this the writer's colleague Mr Bruce Dickins has kindly based the following :—


MARIE

OFE 7 SCE

NCRISTE TO L

AN 7 FIOS GODIA

 EIRTIG ME LET WIRCE

 Eirtig me let wircean 7 fios godian Criste to lofe 7 *Sancte* Marie.

'Eirtig had me built and endowed to the glory of Christ and S. Mary.'

LINCOLN, ST PETER-AT-GOWTS, C³, see above and 388 f., 403.

A note may be usefully added here on the chronology of the Saxon towers of Lincoln and its surrounding territory many of which have already been mentioned.

Professor F. M. Stenton, in his valuable study of the Lincolnshire Domesday in the Lincoln Record Society's volume for 1921, Introduction, p. xxxiii, writes on the familiar subject of Colsuain and his two Lincoln churches. There was nothing about these in the 'Lincoln' volume of the Archaeological Institute of 1848, but about that time Alderman E. J. Willson of Lincoln drew Sir J. H. Parker's attention to them and E. A. Freeman, learning of them from the latter, in Vol. iv of his *Norman Conquest*, p. 218, spoke of the Domesday passage that tells of them, folio 336 b, as forming 'one of the most interesting pieces of local history in England.' Since then they have often been referred to in connection with the general date of these well known 'Lincolnshire' towers. Colsuain, Professor Stenton explains, was an Englishman of Lincoln, who had obtained from the Conqueror a grant of waste land outside the city on which he had 'built and found inhabitants for thirty-six new houses. He also possessed and may be presumed to have built, two churches. . . .' 'It may safely,' he continues, 'be assumed that Colsuain's houses and churches stood in the tract of low-lying land immediately to the south of the Witham, where the towers of the three late eleventh century churches of St Benedict, St Mary le Wigford, and St Peter-at-Gowts, still survive,' and he concludes that 'it can hardly be doubted that two of them are of his foundation.' Though others have doubted this, such too was the conclusion of E. A. Freeman, but the historian naturally considered that the two were the twin western-towered churches, St Mary and St Peter, that might easily have been the work of the same set of craftsmen under a single direction. As we have just seen however, St Mary has upon it the name of its founder and this is not Colsuain, so that Professor Stenton makes

Colsuain's two churches St Peter-at-Gowts and St Benedict. Here at once we run up against a grave difficulty for while St Peter and St Mary are, we have just said, almost twins, St Benedict, as is pointed out above, is of very different proportions, and is more of the type of Harpswell and other examples that affect a Norman rather than a Saxon seeming. Colsuain, who was evidently amongst other things a successful speculative builder, would most probably have kept his two churches to a single type and this consideration inevitably induces a doubt whether after all Colsuain and his churches have been finally landed.

In St Peter and St Mary there is only the enriched tympanum at the former, 389, that is in evidence as a distinctive Norman feature, but one of the caps in the belfry at the same church, shown Fig. 192 x, has volutes and upright leaves, and this combined with the historical considerations adduced by Professor Stenton and noticed in the Preface makes it clear that they were probably erected after the Conquest though not necessarily by Colsuain. It is with real reluctance that their names are here put in italics, for no one who regards the gaunt and vigorous leanness of their build would dream of calling them Norman, but there is no doubt that in a certain sense they represent the Saxo-Norman overlap.

[Lindisfarne, Northumberland, Priory Church. This was included in the first edition in the Saxon list on the ground of the possibility, signalized by Mr Hodges, that there was Saxon work in the lower portion of the apse, but it is now withdrawn as a result of the thorough exploration of the ruins and the ground within and about them, carried on for a number of years past by the Office of Works from its northern headquarters in Edinburgh. Among the most interesting discoveries have been those of several new examples of the small funereal stones of the 'Hartlepool' type but with rounded heads, see Vol. v, Ch. II and III. Architectural results of value have so far not materialized, for, though the whole ground has been dug over, and the position and comparative levels of innumerable stones laid down in a careful plan most kindly communicated to the writer by the Ancient Monuments Department of the Office of Works, no consistent scheme of an early building seems to present itself, and the idea of a Saxon element in the present ruined chancel has been quite given up. That Saxon architecture may still be represented on the site is a possibility, for the parish church which is close to the priory ruins has at the NE angle of the nave what looks like a l. and s. quoin. Mr Peers is inclined to accept it with some hesitation, and the writer on a re-visit noted the alternation of upright stones and flat, somewhat like the work at Heddon-on-the-Wall, 458.]

LINDISFARNE PARISH CHURCH, C, see above.

LUSBY, Lincolnshire, C {nave and chancel} 391. The church has been considerably cut about and the nave shortened on W by about 30 ft., so that half the S doorway has been shorn off. Enough of this doorway has however been left to show that the jambs were constructed Escomb fashion. The N wall with its remarkable NE quoin, and its plinth cut away for a Norman N door, looks Saxon, Fig. 178, and the existence in the N wall of the chancel of a keyhole light with a curious ornament round the head makes it appear that nave and chancel were both originally Saxon. 385.

LYDD, Romney Marsh, Kent, C. All that was known up to 1903 about this interesting fragment of a pre-Conquest basilican church has been already given, 320*. Mr Arthur Finn, of Westbroke House, Lydd, has kindly reported that since then 'the whitewash and plastering has been carefully removed from the Saxon work so that all the existing features are now clearly visible.' No fresh features of interest were brought to light. That the window, Fig. 145 A, was double splayed has been confirmed. 106, 233.

LYMINGE, Kent, A¹. The remains of the early apsidal church of the Kentish type of VII have been noticed, 95. 64.

[Lyminge, Kent, Parish Church, Norman. This stands immediately N of the VII apsidal church which it partly overlies. It has been ascribed to the activity in church building of Dunstan in the last half of X and this is accepted by Rivoira,¹ but there can be little doubt that it is Early Norman, though it may possibly incorporate earlier fragments, as for instance in the middle of the N chancel wall. The nave and chancel are the earliest parts, the aisle and the beautiful W tower are later. As is the case with S Elmham, 310 f.*, there are no Saxon marks, and the general character of the work is Norman as are also the early windows. The walls are thick, 3 ft. 6 in. in nave, 3 ft. 3 in. in chancel, and are constructed of small ragstones and flint set in abundant mortar with much herring-bone work. The technique resembles that seen in the Early Norman enceinte of Rochester Castle and the walls of Mallory Tower.]

MARKET OVERTON, Rutland, C. Here a fine Saxon tower arch, Fig. 9, has been fortunately preserved when the pre-Conquest church of which it formed a part was entirely rebuilt. There is now a W tower, aisled nave, S quasi-transept and chancel, all of XIII or later date. The arch, in a wall 2 ft. 8 in. thick, survives. There are boldly projecting square plinths at the foot of the jambs. 29, 406.

¹ *Lombardic Architecture*, II, 160.

MARTON, Lincs., C³, near the Trent, an interesting church with a good many notable details in belfry openings, and chancel arch, Fig. 193, 3. Some fragments of carved stones with interlacing work, etc., are built into the external face of the W wall of the S aisle.

The W tower is tall and slender with mid-wall work in the belfry openings, and is built of herring-boned rubble plastered. This with the elaboration of the caps makes it certainly post-Conquest though carrying on the Saxon tradition. The through-stones and imposts have the hollow chamfer, which is Saxon rather than Norman, 442. 410.

WEST MERSEA, Essex, C³, a W tower with plain tower arch on step-pattern imposts, in wall 3 ft. 8 in. thick, built with oblong stones set herring-bone fashion and alternating with courses of flat stones. N and S of the tower are lights that seem originally to have been double splayed, and on W face in the ringing chamber is a double splayed circular opening. This last with the imposts is Saxon but the herring-bone work seems post-Conquest. This seems a case of overlap.

MIDDLETON-BY-PICKERING, Yorks., C³ {W tower and probably nave}. A square W tower measuring more from W to E than from N to S is proclaimed as pre-Conquest by the W door to the tower, which has round it Saxon strip-work and measures 9 ft. in height by a width of 2 ft. 10 in. The nave is probably also pre-Conquest. The belfry openings have been modernized, but we may assume normal mid-wall work in their original condition. 193.

[Milborne Port, near Sherborne, Somerset. The S wall of the chancel of this fine Norman church shows unmistakable reminiscences of Saxon pilaster strips, 428.]

MISERDEN, Gloucestershire, C³. Like so many Cotswold churches, Miserden has preserved archaic looking doorways N and S of the nave. The jambs and imposts of these are sometimes of distinct pre-Conquest character. Here there is a stepped impost, horizontally grooved, that looks Saxon, and a hood mould like those at Deerhurst, 394*.

MONK FRYSTON, Yorks., E of Leeds, C³ {W tower}. A square W tower has mid-wall work in all four belfry openings in walls 3 ft. thick. The caps under the through-stones are cubical above but are worked down towards a circular base, 410. They are formed to some extent corbel fashion.

MONKWEARMOUTH, ST PETER, Durham, A² {W porch and nave}. The account given in the text, 120 f., has just been usefully checked in some points through a close examination of the porch and the W wall of the nave, carried out by Messrs Milburn and Sons, F.F.R.I.B.A., of Sunderland, and rendered necessary by the appearance of dangerous cracks in parts of the

walling. Through the kindness of Canon Brown and Mr Milburn the writer was enabled in December, 1924, to examine under their guidance the work, and the result was to confirm the view that porch and W wall were practically contemporaneous. Indeed, the latter must have slightly preceded the former, the relations of the two being similar to those indicated at the W end of St Pancras, Canterbury, 85. The lower part of the N and S walls of the porch are not in bond with the W wall of the nave, but are built up against it, though the masonry of both is of just the same character. Moreover the stripping of plaster from the W face of the W wall within the porch showed evidence of an earlier W doorway much larger than the present entrance from the porch to the nave (cf. Brixworth, 113), that must have been given up when it was decided during the progress of the work to build the W porch, and to reduce the doorway to a proportionate size.

Higher up in the W wall scaffolding has facilitated a close inspection of the two W windows with the baluster shafts in their jambs. These shafts it is now quite certain are original features, but they were taken out and replaced in connection with the extensive operations of about 1866. Their surface when complete is excellently preserved, and there has been made a cast, for a copy of which the writer thanks Mr Milburn.

A fresh examination of the exterior showed that the face belonging to the carved figure that once stood out in relief under the angle of the original gable of the porch, see Fig. 56, not only has its right ear preserved but exhibits the distinct remains on the sinister side of a moustache, a significant appearance on a beardless face, that is found at Walkern, Herts, 483, and occurs also on the face of the Christ in Glory on the Ruthwell Cross, see Vol. v, p. 130. This may be taken to indicate that the figure was a Christ, and flanking figures of Mary and John would seem to be suggested by the two stones visible in Fig. 56 just above the string course under the main figure. These stones project corbel fashion, but curiously enough they are rounded above and do not look as if they had ever served as supports. It is worth noting that this string course, in the Saxon part of the work, has a hollow chamfer, but the Norman ones above on the tower are square in section. There have also been exposed by the stripping off of plaster, preliminary to the necessary grouting and re-pointing, some stones set herring-bone fashion and apparently going through the substance of the thin wall. On this see 244.

It is to be hoped that a complete account of what has come in this way to light will be put on record, and it is satisfactory to know that the needful work on the church, over which Canon Brown keeps so vigilant an eye, has been taken up in so prompt and effective a manner. It should be added that, apart from the present work of strengthening the fabric, Canon Brown

has recently carried out some digging both outside around the W porch, and also within the existing chancel. No traces however of stone-built W adjuncts or of Saxon chancel walls came to light. *Passim*.

MORLAND, Westmorland, C³, an instance of the survival of Saxon forms, in this fine spacious Norman and later church, with a W tower, nave about 75 ft. by 20 ft., with aisles, transepts or transeptal chapels, and chancel. The E wall of the tower, 4 ft. 9 in. thick, as it comes down into the nave, is furnished with a bold plinth in two orders, that does not however make any appearance on the exterior. Above there are double belfry openings on all four faces with mid-wall shafts and plain unmoulded through-stones.

MUCH WENLOCK, Salop, A²?, C³ or Norman?. In a recent volume of *Archaeologia*, LXXII, 1922, the Rev. D. H. S. Cranage, F.S.A., has published the results of some excavations, begun in 1901 and carried on at intervals since, on the presumed site of the Monastery of St Milburga founded here in VII by the grand-daughter of Penda of Mercia, one of the numerous progeny of enthusiastic church builders for whom by the irony of fate that stout old pagan was responsible. There were found here in 1901 some apparently very early remains of a building c. 38 ft. long by 28 ft. broad, (cf. the proportions of St Martin, Canterbury, 38 ft. 6 in. by 24 ft. 6 in., Fig. 2), ending in a small apse, 9 ft. across, hollowed out of a very thick, 7 ft., E wall. This may very possibly be the original work. The next church on the site was that of a re-foundation by Leofric and Godiva about 1050, while the great Norman Priory church dates 1071-1086. Good foundations were found by Mr Cranage of a great central apse, apparently flanked by two smaller apses, square ended externally, at the termination of chancel aisles. 'An unusual feature is the thick wall across the chord of the central apse,' which is of 25 ft. span. Good judges differ as to whether this is of Late Saxon or of Norman origin, but the present writer, influenced largely by the resemblance of the scheme to that of the Early Norman Durham, would ascribe it to the 1071 building, and would bring it into connection with S Elmham, Suffolk, Fig. 141, where there is also a chancel arch of very wide span. In both cases an arcade of columns, on the old Kentish scheme, seems indicated, and the sleeper wall at Much Wenlock is evidence for this.

NASSINGTON, Northants, C {naves}. The spacious and lofty nave of this church, that well sustains the architectural reputation of its district, has retained at its W end Anglo-Saxon l. and s. quoins, best seen from the vestry at the SW corner of the interior. High up in the W wall of the nave, the E wall of the tower, is a doorway with triangular head. The tower itself has been rebuilt. The Saxon nave was more than 60 ft. long.

NETHERAVON, Wiltshire, C³. The W tower here, though probably of post-Conquest workmanship, has preserved exceptionally interesting evidence of the adjuncts built up against, or out from, its N, S, and W walls, 337 f.*. It is to be noted that the fine tower arch 18 ft. high has angle and soffit shafts and corresponding rolls above, 397 f. There is a r. h. doorway high up above the tower arch. 109, 330.

NETTLETON, Lincs., C³, a W tower of 'Lincolnshire' type but with advanced details, such as the quirked chamfer on the impost of the W doorway and the mouldings of the tower arch. Later buttresses have been built up against the tower, and the church is largely modern.

NEWTON, Norfolk, near Castle Acre, C, a square axial tower between a nave a little wider than the tower and a chancel. The ivy at the time of the writer's visit made inspection of details difficult. There is mid-wall work in the belfry openings. 346.

NORTHCHURCH, Herts, C. On this Mr Anderson writes¹ 'the plan of the nave is the only evidence of pre-Conquest date, and, unfortunately, the modern facing outside and the plaster inside prevents any examination of the walls. The church consists of nave 59 ft. by 22 ft., with modern north aisle, north and south transepts, and chancel. The south and west walls of the nave are apparently of pre-Conquest date. The west wall and the return wall on the south have an extra thickness, that in the south wall extending to a length of 25 ft. 7 in.' This would have given an axial tower measuring about 22 ft. square internally, and the feature is a striking one. The nave would then be reduced to a length of about 33 ft. 342.

NORTHLEIGH, Oxfordshire, C³ {tower}. The square tower here now at W was formerly axial (if not central) for the mark of a very high pitched gable is clearly visible against its W wall. There is mid-wall work in all four belfry openings and the caps are of normal cubical form surmounting slightly bellying shafts. No l. and s. quoining visible. The church is specially noted for the beautiful Wilcote Chantry-chapel. 347.

NORTON, Durham, C³. The matured cruciform plan of this important church has been dealt with in the text, 356 f.*. There are no details of special interest. 340.

[Norwich, Cathedral cloister wall, Norman. The W wall against the lower part of which the W walk of the cloister is built is pierced above by a range

¹ The writer is much indebted to Mr A. Whitford Anderson, F.R.I.B.A., of Watford, who kindly sent to him notes on the Saxon churches in Herts that greatly aided him on his own visits.

of circular double splayed openings, with external apertures 2 ft. in diameter and mid-wall opening for light 1 ft. across. The wall is 3 ft. thick. There is no reason to doubt the Norman workmanship of wall and openings, and the appearance is of great importance as showing that in E Anglia at any rate the double splayed window overlaps into the post-Conquest period. The same phenomenon appears to meet us in the case of some Sussex churches, such as Stoughton near Chichester, 419, or Poling, 456, 476.]

NORWICH, ST JOHN TIMBERHILL, C²? This church has some very distinct l. and s. work at the NE quoin of the original chancel as seen from the churchyard. The work is massive and Saxon looking. Nothing else of the kind is to be seen in the church.

NORWICH, ST JULIAN, C³ {round W tower} 423. This interesting church, where on the exterior to S have been recently laid bare what may be remains of the 'anker-hold' of the famous Dame Juliana of Norwich of XIV who wrote *Revelations of Divine Love*, has at the W end of a later nave a fine E Anglian round W tower in the wall of which are good specimens of double splayed r. h. windows with narrow apertures. On the E side of the tower are the marks of a gable of higher pitch than the roof of the present nave.

NORWICH, ST MARY COSLANEY, C³ {tower}. In the tower here there are four double belfry openings of Saxon character but in details Norman. The work is noticed in the text, 422. 266.

OVINGHAM, Northumberland, C³. This is the largest of several Tyneside towers of pre-Conquest date, and measures externally 18 ft. 6 in. N to S by 17 ft. 6 in. E to W. There is the usual mid-wall work in the four belfry openings similar to that at the neighbouring Bywell St Andrew, and the towers also agree in the absence of W doorways. As at Bywell, the quoins of the nave show on each side of the tower, and Saxon work no doubt remains in the nave walls which are only 2 ft. 3 in. thick, and are pierced with later arcades.

OXFORD CATHEDRAL, C¹, the indications at the E end of an earlier building with a triapsidal termination are noted in the text, 218.

OXFORD, ST MICHAEL, C². This notable Oxford landmark, in the Cornmarket, is a very characteristic Saxon W tower, with l. and s. quoins, many interesting openings, and a general appearance of massive simplicity, helped by the fact that the surface of the rugged rubble-built walls is unbroken by any string course or set-off. There has been talk of its connection with the north gate of the city wall that was close beside it. Excavations

made in 1912 showed that the city wall ran along the north boundary of the present churchyard, and there is a good bit of it with a bastion at the back of premises at the W end of the Broad. The old N gate called 'Bocardo' was against the W face of the tower and the buildings of it seem to have projected about 50 or 60 ft. to the north of it, but there appears to be no evidence that the tower formed any part of the defences of the town,¹ though for this it would seem serviceably placed. The openings in the tower are numerous, and amongst them, on the N face at an elevation higher than the aisle roof, is one of those curious doorways that seem to lead nowhither, noticed in the text, 337 f. The doorway is furnished with imposts that have a quirked and hollow chamfer. A wooden gallery might certainly have run from here to the wall, but there is no evidence of it. Below this doorway there are two double splayed lights, one quite low down and the other higher. The wall is here 3 ft. 6 in. thick. On the W face, which would have been up against the wall, there is on the street level a small old blocked doorway with plain imposts and jambs treated Escomb fashion. Incidentally it may be noted that the existence of this opening shows that the church tower was prior to the wall. Above is a doorway without imposts of which the same can be said that was noted above about the opening on the N face. Finally there are to be noticed two stories of double openings on the higher stages of the N and W walls, where the through-stones have, like the imposts, quirks and hollow chamfers, and are upborne by banded baluster shafts of a bellying outline. There are similar double openings on the S face, but to E there is only the double opening on one, the lower, story.

PATTISHALL, Northants, C {nave}. The nave here, 45 ft. by 17 ft. 10 in., with walls about 3 ft. 3 in. thick and some 25 ft. high, is proved to be of Saxon fabric by distinct l. and s. quoins similar to what we find at the neighbouring Greens Norton. That to NW is best preserved, and the quoins to NE and SE are still partly visible, but the S aisle hides the corresponding quoin to SW. There is an old blocked N door, but the chancel and chancel arch are probably post-Conquest. 14, 405*.

GREAT PAXTON, Hunts., near St Neots, C³ {main fabric}. This is a Late Saxon church with Norman detail as well as elements that are not characteristically Saxon but are equally unrecognizable as specifically Norman, Fig. 194 c. It is probably in time post-Conquest. For a notice see text, 368, and the article there referred to. 106, 255, 320, 327, 433 f.

¹ Information kindly furnished in a letter by Mr Henry Minn of Oxford.

PEAKIRK, Northants, C. There is here a W bell-turret, aisled nave, and chancel, the nave arcades being of Late Norman and Early English date. These are cut through Saxon walls for there is an unmistakable l. and s. quoin at the SE angle of the nave. Some of the upright stones are over 3 ft. high. The NE quoin is obscured by later work and the W end has been altered. The nave wall to S is only 2 ft. 2 in. thick.

ST PETER-ON-THE-WALL, BRADWELL, Essex, A³, 101 f.*. 34, 99 f., 108, 118, 171, 177, 239, 329, 429.

PETERBOROUGH, A² or B¹?. Foundations of Saxon Abbey church preserved beneath the present Norman S transept and adjacent parts. A 'crux commissa' plan of ample proportions with a square ended presbytery. For plan and description see 168 f.*. 58, 168, 187.

POLING, Sussex, C³. In itself this small charmingly placed church would not strike the visitor as any different from the numerous late XI or early XII Sussex churches noticed, 456, but N of the nave in a wall about 2 ft. 5 in. thick there is a double splayed window, with inclined jambs.

RECVLVER, Kent, A², 95 f.*. 30, 58, 64, 97 f., 106 f., 239, 320, 383 f.

REED, Herts, C³. The church¹ lies a little E of the main line of the Ermine Street between Buntingford and Royston, and has retained its Saxon nave, measuring internally 34 ft. by 19 ft. 3 in. with walls c. 2 ft. 6 in. thick, and exhibiting l. and s. quoins at all its four angles. The fabric of the walls is flint rubble. A blocked N door gives the date as very near the Conquest, for the timidly treated angle shafts have caps with crudely moulded volutes, rather like those on the chancel arch of Wharram-le-Street (*Archaeologia*, LXXIII, p. 63), and the half-formed roll on the archivolt resembles the rolls treated in a similarly timid fashion round the belfry windows at Langford, Oxfordshire, exhibiting as we have seen mixed features, 280*, 415*.

REPTON, Derbyshire, B¹?, C¹, C³, see text, 312 f.***. Capitals, 315, 410; arcading, 317; vaulting, 316. 70, 112, 216, 255, 281, 323, 340, 348, 373, 383 f., 405*.

RESTENNET PRIORY, FORFARSHIRE, Scotland. The tower here, the only part that survives of the original priory church, possesses much the same character as the tower of St Regulus at St Andrews, but is much poorer in distinctive features. The pre-Norman character of the arch in the E wall of it has been referred to in the text, 67. 17, 327.

RIPON, Yorkshire, A² {crypt of about 675} 146 f., 161 f.*. 320, 323, 383.

ROCHESTER, Kent, A¹ {bishop's church of c. 604} 95. 57, 64, 99 f.

¹ See note on page 473.

- ROCKLAND ALL SAINTS, Norfolk, C³? The nave, internally c. 34 ft. by 19 ft., with walls 3 ft. 5 in. thick and about 18 ft. high, has l. and s. work at all its four quoins. For a specimen see Fig. 6. The work is careful, but small in character and probably late. There are no ancient openings.
- ROMSEY, Hants, C¹ and Norman. The magnificent Norman church at Romsey supersedes a Saxon edifice built when King Edgar in 967 refounded the establishment for a community of Nuns. In 1900, when new flooring was being laid in the nave the discovery was made under the present tower of the lowest part of the walls of the Saxon apse proving that the earlier church ended at the present crossing. Something of this can still be seen by opening a trap door near the pulpit. In the account of the present church in *V.C.H.*, Hants, iv, 460 f., attention is called to indications in the present S aisle which seem to point to the possession by the Saxon church of a plan resembling that of Deerhurst.
- ROPSLEY, Lincs., near Grantham, C {nave}. This finely situated church, see Frontispiece to Vol. 1, preserves its Saxon nave of long and narrow proportions, about 45 ft. by 15 ft. 3 in., and of a loftiness due to the Perpendicular clearstory. The walls, 2 ft. 6 in. thick, have l. and s. work on all the four quoins, cut back as at Wittering, Fig. 31, for plastering. The SE quoin is visible internally, the others outside the church.
- ROTHWELL, Lincolnshire, C³, a 'Lincolnshire' tower with some late details. There is a plinth to the tower of two chamfered orders and though the tower itself is quite plain with no character in the quoins, the S angle of the old W wall of the nave, forming the lower part of the E wall of the tower, exhibits a l. and s. quoin. There is a W doorway similar to that at Clee, Lincs., Fig. 183, but with a solid tympanum. The tower arch is lofty and quite plain. In the belfry openings the caps on the mid-wall shafts are of matured cubical type and post-Conquest, Fig. 192 iii.
- SCARTHO, Lincs., C³, a W tower with mid-wall work introducing capitals with volutes and upright leaves of Norman aspect. Fig. 192 ix. 412.
- SCOLE, Norfolk, near Diss, C, the only Saxon sign here remaining is some l. and s. work at the top of the SE quoin of the original nave the wall of which on S is 2 ft. 3 in. thick. The other quoins are concealed by later building, such as the recent organ chamber which obliterates the NE quoin, or by ivy, but what is visible is distinct and quite significant.
- SHERBORNE, Dorset, C. Of the Saxon bishop's church here, the successor of the first Christian church which Aldhelm may have built, there remains embedded in the W wall of the present edifice a Late Saxon blocked door-

way, the evidence in which of strip-work round the opening renders its character and general date assured. 12.

OLD SHOREHAM, Sussex, C. In this fine church, in which there is apparent Norman work of at least two periods, there is a Saxon remnant at the W end of the N wall. This part of the N wall is differently aligned from the rest of the N wall further E and is thicker—over 3 ft. as against 2 ft. 2 in. in the eastward wall—and the two join corner to corner about 18 ft. from the NW quoin. The surest indication that this westerly bit of the N wall is of Saxon date is the existence 8 ft. 4 in. from the NW quoin of a blocked doorway with strip-work round the opening, and big stone jambs. The Early Norman N and S doorways further E in the N wall (one of which is cut into by a Late Norman window) are quite different from the Saxon one.

SHORNE, Kent, C {nave}. There is here a small double splayed light above the later arcade cut through the N wall which is 2 ft. 6 in. thick. It is high up, about 18 ft. 6 in. from the present floor. The E-most arch of this arcade is plain and probably Early Norman, and the walls of the nave which is 21 ft. wide may be taken as substantially Saxon.

[Shrewsbury, St Mary. No Saxon work is here visible, but when the heating apparatus was being put in in 1864 remains were found under the present nave and W part of the chancel of an earlier apsidal church that may have come down from the last half of X.¹ The lateral walls of the nave corresponded, though not exactly with the lines of the present arcades.]

SIDBURY, Devon, C³, the small Saxon crypt here furnishing evidence of a square ended chancel has been noticed in the text, 324.

SINGLETON, Sussex, C {W tower, and nave?}. The church is mainly XIII work, but the tower and perhaps in part the nave walls are pre-Conquest. The tower walls are only 2 ft. 8 in. thick and in the lower part to N, S and W there are three double splayed lights the central apertures having been widened by cutting away. The jambs of the tower arch are partly in through-stones but the arch is pointed. The tower measures more from W to E than from N to S, but there is no sign of a W door.

SKILLINGTON, Lincs., C {nave}. The nave here, about 31 ft. by 18 ft. in internal measurement with walls 2 ft. 5 in. thick, has l. and s. work cut back for plaster on its NE quoin.

SKIPWITH, Yorks., near Selby, C³ {W tower, and nave?}. The fine Saxon tower here has been mentioned more than once in the text and the W part of the, then aisleless, nave is probably of the same time, perhaps about 1040

¹ *Transactions of Shropshire Arch. Soc.*, 2nd Ser., vi, 358-371.

the date of Stow. For the chamber in the tower see 332 f. The present belfry stage is of XV and probably replaces the upper part of the Saxon belfry stage where we may safely assume mid-wall work. 282, 332, 355.

SOCKBURN, Durham, B¹ ? {nave}. The possibility of an early date for the fragments of Saxon work was discussed, 191. 68, 69*.

LITTLE SOMBORNE, Hants, C {nave}. This small building consists only of a nave with the remains of the arch leading to the chancel now destroyed. Saxon indications showing that the nave is of pre-Conquest origin are a l. and s. quoin at the NW angle, and a pilaster strip in the W portion of the N wall. The old blocked N and S doors and the old windows have no special Saxon character.

SOMERFORD KEYNES, Wilts, B¹, exhibits only the narrow N door of the nave; discussed, 189. 280.

SOMPTING, Sussex, C³ {W tower}. Only the W tower here can claim a Saxon derivation, for the rest of the church is Norman and later. The remarkable features of the first are discussed, 391, 430 f. 248 f.*, 355, 399.

SPRINGTHORPE, Lincs., C³ {W tower}. This example in the group between Lincoln and Gainsborough where are Glentworth, Harpswell, etc., is no doubt of the familiar Lincolnshire type, though the actual belfry stage is modern. There is a blocked W door to the tower of the Clee type though simpler. There is herring-bone work low down in the tower walls.

STANTON-BY-BRIDGE, Derbyshire, near Swarkeston S of Derby, C {nave and chancel, in part}. The church would be pronounced Norman, but for a patch of irregular masonry of different character from the rest of the fabric incorporated in the W wall. That parts of a Saxon church remain is shown by the existence, under the ivy and hard to come at, of l. and s. quoins at the SE corner of the nave and at the E corners of the chancel.¹ This shows that the plain chancel arch is probably Saxon, and the voussoirs are in reality through-stones, 28, note.

STANTON LACY, Shropshire, C² {nave and N transept}, described in the text, 359 f. 240, 407.

STEVINGTON, Beds., C {W tower}. The Saxon remains in this otherwise interesting church are confined to the lower part of the W tower now enclosed in the church by the prolongation westward of the aisles. There is here a very narrow S door, about 9 ft. high by a width of 2 ft. 6 in. in a wall 2 ft. 7 in. thick, and above it, and also in the N wall opposite, are double played windows. In that on S in the middle of the thickness of the wall is

¹ These were shown to the writer by Mr C. B. Sherwin, of Derby.

an ancient and probably Saxon wooden board with the aperture cut in it with sloping jambs 31 in. high and $10\frac{1}{2}$ in. wide below and 7 in. above. The tower to the height of 20 ft. is built of rough rubble and there is distinct l. and s. work on the NW quoin. 15, 36.

STOKE D'ABERNON, Surrey, B¹? {nave and chancel?}. This church famous for its early brasses, the chancel of which is vaulted, has, on S, the W part of the wall of the chancel and the E part of the wall of the nave of pre-Conquest work.¹ This is in rubble of small stones and flints with a considerable use of Roman bricks set herring-bone fashion which is not necessarily always a Norman indication, see 244. Some have thought the Roman material to be in situ, and the discovery in 1909, by Mr P. Mainwaring Johnston, of indications in the N wall of the chancel of the beginning of an apse in Roman-like material and technique has suggested that the original building was pre-Saxon. It is sufficient however to note the Saxon character of the S wall, which has, in the nave, in the upper part a blocked square headed opening of early aspect, and a Saxon sundial cut rudely on the face of a cylindrical projection of 6 in. from a square stone built into the wall, and to all appearance in its original position, 15. This S wall is 2 ft. 7 in. thick and of considerable height.

STONE-BY-FAVERSHAM, Kent, A¹. See text, 116.

STOPHAM, Sussex, C³. This interesting church is hard to date, but there are early looking N and S doors to the nave, the jamb and springing of the arch of the old S door were given in Fig. 184 bis, and the comparatively advanced character of the work, suggesting Norman influence, was noticed. A later porch has been built in front of it.

STOUGHTON, Sussex, Norman, 419, with Saxon survivals especially in the form of two double splayed windows. 327, 329, 342, 400.

STOW, Lincolnshire, C³ {transepts and crossing of about 1040} 354 f. 22, 70, 273, 281, 307, 427*.

STOWE-NINE-CHURCHES, Northants, C² {W tower and tower arch}. A Saxon W tower, in rather a bad condition, has a double splayed window on its W face. The tower arch opening to the nave in a wall 2 ft. 11 in. thick is very characteristically Saxon. So far as the whitewash permits an examination the jambs and voussoirs seem to be through-stones. The former have square imposts, that have been cut away on the soffits flush with the jambs and the stones of the springing (which are not set back on the jambs), but are returned on the E face so as to serve as caps for the flanking pilaster strips of square section, now mostly cut away. Above these returned imposts

¹ Jessep, *Pre-Conquest Architecture in Hampshire and Surrey*, p. 25.

is a square hood mould, the whole being a specimen of strip-work round an opening. The rest of the church is later. There are some interesting cross shaft fragments.

RAGGLETHORPE, Lincs., C, a simple nave, with N aisle all under one roof and no chancel, has an old doorway at the W end with triangular head as at Dunham Magna, Norfolk. It has slightly sloping jambs.

RETHALL, Essex, C {main fabric}. We have here to deal with a Saxon nave, 26 ft. by 15 ft. 6 in., practically complete save for a later tower arch and modern windows. The chancel arch in a wall 2 ft. 2½ in. thick is surrounded with three narrow strips close together, resembling what we see at St John sub Castro, Lewes, and has imposts scored horizontally, again as at Lewes, but on the chamfer below there are carved saltires which have a certain Norman suggestion. There are saltires however on the W door of the porch at Corbridge, 143, where there is no suggestion of the kind. The jambs are of the Escomb type with square upright slabs, 1 ft. 9 in. high by the 2 ft. 2½ in. of the wall, with flat slabs 3 in. to 5 in. thick binding in to this. The plaster makes it impossible to be sure if the voussoirs are through-stones. The S door has also kept its Saxon jambs, chamfered later and surmounted by a pointed arch. The only ancient windows are two in the W wall, the E wall of the later tower, 2 ft. 2 or 3 in. thick, one a r. h. double splayed light above the later tower arch, and another circular and about 8 in. across high up in the gable of the roof.

Externally the walls are seen to be built of good flint rubble without coursing or herring-boning, and l. and s. quoins are in excellent preservation at the two W extremities. The 'long' stone to SW is 3 ft. high. The SE quoin has been made up fresh and that to NE is hidden by a buttress.

VALCLIFFE, Oxfordshire, C³ {nave}. Here a nave, 19 ft. 5 in. wide, with walls 2 ft. 6 in. thick has had N and S XII and XIII arcades cut through it which have allowed the survival of original windows on each side on a line c. 13 ft. 6 in. from the floor. They are widely splayed internally with a narrow r. h. external aperture which has encircling it three projecting half-rounds. The proportions of the nave are not markedly Saxon and the nave walls now 30 ft. high may have been raised, but they are thin walls, and the mouldings round the window heads remind us of Somerford Keynes, 190, so that Sir Henry Dryden may be followed in giving the church a place on the Saxon list.

WALLOW, Lincolnshire, C³ {W tower}. Here the belfry stage has been 'restored' with Norman belfry openings, but the tower is of 'Lincolnshire' type with tower arch on plain chamfered imposts nearly 11 ft. high by 7 ft. wide. The voussoirs are of Norman type.

SWANSCOMBE, Kent, near Gravesend, C. This church suffered greatly from a fire caused by lightning in August 1902, which destroyed the woodwork in the W tower, the nave roof, etc., but left untouched the one feature of undoubted pre-Conquest descent, the double splayed window in the lower part of the S wall of the tower. The N and S walls of the nave are thin, about 2 ft. 3 in., but the W wall and the E wall of the tower is a foot thicker. There are marks of old int. splayed windows in both nave and chancel, but their general appearance is more Norman than Saxon. The double splayed window in the tower is constructed with Roman bricks and these are laid in what we have called Tredington fashion, 426, there being no real attempt to turn the arched head of the opening with material arranged on the radiating principle, and the head is 'made up' in a fanciful style though with neat technique.

SYSTON, Lincs., C³ {W tower}. The W tower has mid-wall work but with advanced detail, such as angle shafts on the jambs of the double openings and coupled mid-wall shafts under the through-stones to N and S. This work looks later than the lower part of the tower and represents only a survival. A similar overlap is in evidence in the chancel arch which has a soffit shaft with a thoroughly Norman volute cap with upright leaves below that carries a soffit roll that as we have seen, 398 f., is rather Late Saxon than Norman in tradition.

THORNAGE, Norfolk, C³, double splayed lights. Arch, 425.

[Thurlby, Lincolnshire, near Bourn. A fresh examination of this example has convinced the writer that the indications of l. and s. work on the quoins, especially the NW quoin of the tower, are not positive enough to be pronounced Saxon. Nor are the proportions of the interior, or the thin walls, 2 ft. 4 in., or the plain ancient tower arch under-built with a later one, or even the triangular headed opening to the nave in the E wall of the tower.]

TICHBORNE, Hants, C³ {chancel}. The nave here may be of XI fabric but there are no Saxon features. On the other hand the chancel is well supplied with these though in late forms, and it has its E wall preserved. There are pilaster strips of shallow projection but abnormal widths. The NE and SE quoins have strips 2 ft. wide clasping the corners, and there are others 13 in. wide in the middle of the N, E, and S walls. Near the E end of the N and S walls are double splayed windows with narrow r. h. apertures cut in central slabs.

TITCHFIELD, Hants, B {W tower, W wall of nave}. The pre-Conquest features of the important church were noted in the text, 191 f. 67, 329.

TREDINGTON, Worcestershire, C {nave}, a remarkable Third-Period church, with nave of ample proportions, 56 ft. 6 in. by 21 ft. 3 in., the walls of which, 2 ft. 10 in. thick, are pierced with arcades of transitional style, the W-most arches of which are curtailed by the later W tower. The pointed arches of the arcades still allow to appear on each wall the remains of four double splayed windows, the arch-technique of which is illustrated in Fig. 198. An extraordinary and indeed unique feature is the appearance on a line with these original upper windows of the remains of N and S doorways, now in a clearstory wall but originally in the outer wall of the aisleless church, that must have given access from without by means of wooden stairs to an internal gallery in the nave. See *V.C.H.*, Worcestershire, Vol. III, p. 547 f. 384.

TURVEY, Beds., C {nave}, a large church a good deal modernized, remarkable for the excellent ironwork on the S door, has preserved on the S side of the nave two double splayed windows, which indicate a Saxon origin for the three W-most bays of the nave.

WALTHAM, Lincolnshire, C³ {tower}. This church was rebuilt all but the tower in 1869. The tower, axial originally, stood between a nave and a chancel, the modern transepts make it central. It has the usual Lincolnshire belfry openings, with restored details. 347.

WALKERN, Herts, C³ {nave}. On the strength mainly of the thinness of its walls, 2 ft. 3 in., to which may be added faint reminiscences of Escomb technique in the jambs of the S arcade, the nave of this church, that has later aisles and chapels and W tower and chancel, is given pre-Conquest rank in the Herts Monument *Report*, and this we may accept. The nave measures 37 ft. 6 in. by 20 ft. 6 in., and built into the S face of the S wall near its W end are the remains of an apparently Saxon Rood carved in chalk, consisting of a mutilated figure 4 ft. high, doubtless of Christ, that seems to have worn a moustache, 471, and has the knot of the belt round the loins arranged a good deal like that on the Daglingworth slab, 450, representing St Peter.

WARBLINGTON, Hants, C {central, formerly W, tower}. All that is Saxon in this very interesting church is the second story of a small pre-Conquest tower only 9 ft. square in external measurement that now rises from the midst of an ample church of XIII and later. A full and clear account of the history of the building is given by Mr C. R. Peers in *V.C.H.*, Hants, Vol. III, p. 137 f. The tower was evidently once a W one with a Saxon nave and chancel to E of it. In early XIII a new nave was built W of the tower and later in the same century the original nave and chancel were replaced by the present large new chancel. The ground story of the tower was at the same time completely opened out to clear the interior of the new church,

but the second story was suffered to remain. Here in walls 2 ft. 3 in. thick are three doorways opening N, S and W, the E wall not being pierced. These doorways are of the kind we have already come to know so well, and must have been connected with subsidiary buildings abutting on these faces of the tower. This instance of a Saxon survival is of remarkable interest, and the church that is possessed of some beautiful mediaeval fittings is well worthy of a visit. 338.

WARDEN, Northumberland, C {W tower}. This is a Tyneside tower that ranks with Bywell St Andrew, Ovingham, and others, but it possesses original features. The plan of the tower arch has been noticed, 403, and also its Roman imposts, 407, and the absence of any upper doorway to the nave, 333, note. The belfry stage has been modernized externally, but Mr Hodges in his account of the tower¹ gives the interesting information that the interior wall-faces are still in their ancient condition, and 'the four belfry windows exhibit plain openings, three feet in width, with square jambs, supporting plain square-soffitted arches.' The fact here attested is of much importance as it seems to present an exception to the almost universal rule in Saxon towers that the belfry openings are double. If Warden could be proved to be early it might show a form of belfry opening that preceded in point of time the double openings with the mid-wall work. The exceptional plan of the jambs of the tower arch Mr Hodges thought early from its resemblance to what we find in Hexham crypt, and the small dimensions of the arch, only 8 ft. 6 in. high and less than 5 ft. 6 in. in width, with its rude construction, may be held to bear this out. It is unfortunate that in the case of the two W towers that have been taken in the text as in all probability our earliest, Brixworth and Deerhurst, the original belfry openings have not been preserved, for if they had agreed with Warden the fact would have had great significance.

WAREHAM, ST MARTIN, Dorset, C² {main fabric}, a very complete Third-Period church that stands on the Saxon ramparts of the town, and has preserved its l. and s. quoins at the E angles of both chancel and nave. The proportions of the nave are not specially Saxon, for it is 16 ft. 6 in. wide by an original length of only 25 ft., that was extended westwards in XIII. The height of the walls both of nave and chancel is however very marked and characteristic. They are also decidedly thin, the N nave wall about 1 ft. 10 in. thick, that of the chancel about 2 ft. 1 in. The original windows are internally splayed. The masonry is of good, well fitted, but imperfectly squared, stones. 22*, 36.

¹ *The Reliquary*, April, 1893.

WESTMILL, Herts, C {part of nave}. The church lies a little W of the Ermine Street about $1\frac{1}{2}$ mile S of Buntingford, and has been extensively restored so that the only early features are a l. and s. quoin at the SE angle of the nave, and some old stones worked in to other parts. The nave measures internally 41 ft. 6 in. by 21 ft.

WEYBOURN, NEAR HOLT, Norfolk. In the church of the priory here there is Saxon work in the ruined tower the ground story of which was once used as a chancel. 347.

WHARRAM-LE-STREET, Yorkshire, C³. This church, a conspicuous instance of Saxo-Norman overlap, has been noticed, 421, and was fully discussed and illustrated in a paper by Mr John Bilson in *Archaeologia*, LXXIII, 55 f. 15, 193, 410, 442, 476.

WHITFIELD, NEAR DOVER, Kent, C {main fabric}, an excellent example of a small Saxon nave-and-chancel church of the Third Period, where the chancel has been extended and aisles were added without destroying the nave walls, which are about 2 ft. thick and more than 15 ft. high. In the




FIG. 208, Plan and section of Whitfield Church, Kent.

S wall there is preserved a double splayed window. The altered chancel arch admits us to a space originally about 9 ft. 6 in. square, but this has been now extended eastwards. The chancel walls were only 1 ft. 9 in. thick. A good deal of the old plastering survives. See plan and section, Fig. 208.

WHITTINGHAM, Northumberland, C³ {W tower, and part of nave}. The lower part of a Saxon W tower with a fine tower arch and portions of the nave walls have survived from pre-Conquest times. The l. and s. work on the lower part of the tower quoins and also on the W quoins of the Saxon nave is strongly marked, and it is the most northerly example of the work in Great Britain. Rickman in his sixth edition, of 1862, figures the tower before the alteration in its upper part, and there was then a double belfry opening on W, but only a single one, as at Warden, to S. For the tower

arch see 404.¹ It is in a wall 2 ft. 9 in. thick, and the nave walls are 2 ft. 6 in. thick and have preserved proof of their Saxon workmanship at the NW end.

WICKHAM, Berks, C¹ or ² {W tower}. On the Roman road that runs from Speen (Spinae) near Newbury towards NW, the square W tower of this church exhibits the classical feature of small but well designed Roman shafts rather elaborately moulded, see Fig. 32, in the double openings to N and S in the uppermost story of the Anglo-Saxon part of the tower, which has had a modern belfry stage added above. The tower exhibits double splayed openings and l. and s. quoins and is obviously earlier in date than the so-called 'Lincolnshire' towers, 386. It may be noted, as bearing on what has been said about Warden, that on the same level as the double, and presumably belfry, openings with the Roman shafts there is to W a wide single double splayed opening, and no opening to E. 60, 259.

WILSFORD, Lincolnshire, C {nave}. Here at the SE corner of the nave is an excellent l. and s. quoin, a 'long' stone near the ground being 4 ft. 3 in. high. The nave wall on N is 2 ft. 5 in. thick, and may of course be substantially Saxon. Its great height is due to the later clearstory.

WING, Bucks., C² {main fabric}. See text, 320 f. 11, 32 f., 106, 112, 187, 219, 243, 263, 280, 317, 327, 384.

WINSTONE, Glos, C³, N doorway like Ampney Crucis, 395*.

WINTERTON, Lincolnshire, C² or ³ {W end of nave, W tower}. This 'Lincolnshire' tower in the NW corner of the county is itself certainly post-Conquest. The upper story with the present belfry openings is of XIII but below this it is Saxon in form and details though the caps on the mid-wall shafts in the four original double belfry openings, now blocked save to N, are normal cushion caps like Fig. 192 11, and that to S has on its outer face a chequer pattern which is characteristically, though not exclusively, Norman, just as the step-pattern in Fig. 199, from Stow, is Saxon. The tower arch has a quirked chamfer on its imposts. The quoins are of ordinary masonry. There is a round sound hole over each double opening. This late XI tower is however built up against the W wall of an earlier, clearly pre-Conquest, nave, for the W face of this, with the original plaster and whitewash still on it, can be seen on S to run in behind the E extremity of the S wall of the tower. The tower walls are about 3 ft. 9 in. thick, those of the nave about 2 ft. 9 in., and the W wall of the nave was thickened when it became virtually the E wall of the tower.

¹ The writer thanks the Vicar, the Rev. R. D. Ellwood, for kind information about the recent history of the church. The drawing presented by Mr Turnbull Dixon of Rothbury is given in Fig. 189.

The late Canon Fowler, who spent the last years of his life at Winterton, noticed this discovery in the *Proc. Soc. Ant.*, xx, 1904, and emphasized the interest of the find of Saxon whitewash still preserved. He kindly explained the discovery to the writer shortly before the close of his long and fruitful labours on the archaeology of his country and district. What was the date of the Saxon church, and how far the present nave walls are original, it would not be easy to determine. The mark of a very high pitched chancel roof remain visible on its E wall.

WITLEY, Surrey, C³ {double splayed windows}. To add to the charms of this favoured spot a discovery was recently made of a double splayed window in the S wall of the nave, to which may probably be added another in the gable of the W wall. The S wall is 3 ft. 6 in. thick, and the windows are to be regarded as Saxon survivals in an Early Norman fabric, as at Poling, Sussex, 456. There is some old painting on the recently opened jamb, but the details show that it cannot be Saxon.

WITTERING, Northants, C³ {main fabric}. The plan, Fig. 209, exhibits a characteristic and singularly well preserved Saxon nave-and-chancel church to which a later W tower and N aisle and chancel chapel have been




FIG. 209, Plan of Wittering Church, Northamptonshire.

added. The two E quoins of the chancel and the SE and SW quoins of the nave are in the excellent l. and s. technique shown in Fig. 31 which dates the church in Period C. The remarkable chancel arch of Late Saxon character, 398 f., is shown in Fig. 186. 32, 56, 279, 370, 399, 406.

WITTON, Norfolk, C {nave}. Round W tower and N wall of nave with double splayed lights. For plan see Fig. 197. The S arcade is on the line of the original S wall, and the Saxon nave measured c. 39 ft. by 16 ft. 9 in.

[Wivelsfield, near Brighton, Sussex, 370. The N door of the nave has an enriched archivolt so closely resembling that above the S door at Bolney not far away that both must have been executed by the same mason or masons.

The design, of alternate half-rounds and angles, is however of Norman character, and the churches have not been placed on the present list. As a whole they have nothing Saxon about them.]

WOODSTONE, Hunts., near Peterborough, C. Here there survives, embodied in the later W tower, a patch of older masonry with a double-splayed r. h. window, the head of which is rudely turned in flat stones set edgewise and bedded in reddish mortar.

WOOLBEDING, Sussex, C, remarkable for its pilaster strips in the S (5) and N (3) walls, Fig. 7. The nave measures internally 34 ft. 8 in. by 19 ft. 3 in., but there are no other specially Saxon features apparent.

WOOTTON WAWEN, Warwickshire, C³ {central tower}. This fine and interesting church has only the central tower preserved from pre-Conquest times, and the points of interest which attach to this have been noticed in the text, 360 f. and Fig. 165. 30, 68*, 340, 396.

WORLABY, Lincs., C³ {W tower}. This 'Lincolnshire' tower has been rebuilt, but it was reported on by Canon Fowler as of the primitive type. The plain lofty tower arch has been put back.


WORTH, Sussex, C³ {complete Saxon cruciform church} 362 f.*; double windows in nave, 33*, and Fig. 14. 70, 263, 384, 407.

WROXETER, Salop, A or B? {part of nave}. As was pointed out in the text, 194, this church, within the Roman walls of Viroconium, might well be of very early origin. Most of the building is Norman and later, though Roman stones are freely used everywhere, but the earliest part, the E portion of the N wall, 2 ft. 11 in. thick, is quite distinctive in character. The masonry here is in massive squared Roman stones, 2 ft. to 2 ft. 6 in. long by c. 18 in. high, much larger on the average than those used in other parts, and this work ends with a straight joint some distance from the present W wall which represents a later extension westwards, 435. In the original wall is a small square headed window with lintel neatly cut in a single large stone, much after the pattern of the Escomb window, Fig. 65, B. The aperture is filled in with small stones, including what looks like a drum of a small lathe-turned shaft. All this may look towards VII or VIII, but at the top of this regular Romanizing masonry and evidently part of it there runs a projecting string course, square in section, that was returned along the original W wall. Now regarding this as an indication of date, we must note first that a string course, similar but hollow chamfered, runs round three sides of the VII porch at Monkwearmouth just at the springing of its original gable, but it is not a feature on other early, A or B, buildings, whereas

it comes into fairly common use in connection with pilaster strips in the work of Period C. Here it is used without pilaster strips and this may weaken it as an indication of probable lateness, so that on the whole the generally archaic look of the bit of walling may be allowed in the meantime the benefit of the doubt, and the work is here marked provisionally A or B.

[YORK. The herring-bone stonework in the crypt of the cathedral, 75, is evidently of Norman date. About other early churches on the Minster site which have left no remains, see 146 f.] 41, 119, 146, 177, 186, 320, 383.

YORK, *ST MARY BISHOPHILL JUNIOR*, not far from the station, C³ {W tower}, presents to us a fine but obviously late W tower of the 'Lincolnshire' type, of which what is necessary has been said in the text, 403 f. 69, 398.



INDEX II

ANGLO-SAXON ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES AND DETAILS

In accordance with the practice in previous volumes this Index includes entries of some length, in which an endeavour is made, by means of sub-headings, to provide a conspectus of the chief facts connected with subjects like the Apse in Anglo-Saxon churches, Arch Construction, Columns, Openings, Plans, Walls, etc.

In such entries, as the reader will see, complete logical consistency in arrangement and subordination is at times rendered almost impossible by the bewildering complexity and variety in Anglo-Saxon architectural forms.

'Etc.' signifies that other examples occur, but not so numerous as would be implied by 'passim.'

AACHEN, Minster at, see Index III: Its influence on Saxon forms, 234 f., 372; this influence continuous, 237.
 Acanthus, 207, Carolingian, at Barnack, 275; at Langford, 433, 463.
 Adjuncts, Lateral, see 'Porches, Lateral, Side-Chapels and Transepts'; Western, see 'Porches, Western.'
 Aisled churches, Aisles, see 'Basilicas, Saxon.'
 Altars: their position in Saxon churches, 78 f., 91, 157 f.;
 In porticus or side-chapels, 85 f., 194, 302;
 Multiplication of, 91, 147, 178, 180 n., 182 f.
 Ambulatory, in crypts, Brixworth, 111, Wing, 321*.
 Angle shafts, see 'Columns.'
 Anglo-Saxon architecture: sui generis, 375; its general character, v, 1, +, 19, 66, 176, 208, 220, 225, 231, 327 f., 417, 439, 442;
 Chronology of, vii, 1 f., 15, 23, 71, 271, 325 f., 439;
 Its distinction from Norman, 19 f., 231, 379, 428, 468;
 Its Austrasian affinities, 6, 232 f., 376;
 Its defects, 4, 65 f., 70, 76, 283, 372, 379;
 Its merits, v, 273, 283, 370, 381; interest of it, 372;
 Megalithic feeling in, 25, 46, 50, 279, 359, 370, 391, 404, 442, 466;
 Curious devices in, 37, 75 f., 104;

Not to be judged from extant monuments only, 10, 269, 380 f.;
 Distribution of monuments, 18;
 Recognition of it abroad, ix f.;
 Continental analogies with, 375;
 Connection with Scandinavia, xvii.
 Apse, apses, non-Saxon, see Index III.
 Apses, Saxon: used in greater churches, 435, not as a rule in smaller churches, save in Kent, 310, 435;
 Statistic of; extant examples in use, Brixworth, 108*, 116, 218 n., Wing, 321*, Worth, 362*;
 Ruined or preserved in traces, St Pancras Canterbury, 83* f., Deerhurst Church, 208*, N Elmham, 343 f.*, Lyminge, 95, Oxford Cathedral, 218, St Peter-on-the-Wall, 101 f., Reculver, 96 f.*, Rochester, 95*, Romsey, 477, Hexham, 173;
 Conjectured, St Augustine Canterbury, 91*, St Martin, *ibid.*, 81*, Lydd, 321*, Much Wenlock, 472, Stoke d'Abernon, 480, Shrewsbury, 478;
 Western, Abingdon, 117, Canterbury Cathedral (pre-Saxon), 78*;
 Duplicated, 76 f., 95 n., 117, 233;
 Flanking main apse, 217 f., 472.
 Forms of; semicircular, Lyminge, 95, Reculver, 98*, N Elmham, 344*;
 Semicircular, stilted, St Peter-on-the-Wall, 102, 104, Worth (re-

- built), 363*, Romsey, 477, Brixworth (interior only), 108*, Deerhurst Church, interior only (?), 218, St Pancras (perhaps semi-elliptical), 83*;
 Semi-elliptical, Rochester, 96*;
 Polygonal inside and out, Wing, 322*;
 Polygonal outside, Brixworth, 108*;
 Deerhurst, 218 n.;
 Square outside, Much Wenlock, 472.
 Arcades, see Index III.
 Arcading, decorative, on external walls:
 Round headed, Barton-on-Humber, 291*, Bradford-on-Avon, 298* f., Branston, 390*, 445, Earls Barton, 284 (Frontispiece), 285*, Repton (incomplete), 315*, 317, Wing, 323*;
 Triangular headed, Deerhurst apse, 219* n., Earls Barton, 284, Geddington, 453; Rivoira on, 242.
 Arch construction, Saxon:
 Round arched heads; voussoirs normally cut and set, 28*, 359*, etc.;
 Irregularities; in cutting of voussoirs, 65, abnormal shapes, 67*, 68*;
 in setting of voussoirs, 66;
 at spring of arch, 66 f.*, 194, 223, 462,
 at crown of arch (Tredington fashion), 425* f., 464, 482;
 Voussoirs as through-stones, 27 f.*, 67 f., etc.;
 Voussoirs not through-stones but still Saxon, 29, 361, 404, etc.;
 Keystone, at Wootton Wawen, 362 (exceptional);
 Arch cut in lintel, 35, 141*, 190, etc.;
 Tympanum; open, 396*, etc., with flat lintel below, chamfered on top edge, 68*, 361;
 Filled in, 394*; with flat lintel below, chamfered on top edge, 395*;
 Enriched (a Norman feature), 388*, 394*;
 Arch set back on jambs, 29, 35, 81, 104, 460, etc.;
 Arch recessed, 29, with soffit roll, 398 f.;
 Straight sided arch, or triangular head, 30*, 210;
 Arch of abnormal form, Bedford, 444;
 turned in rubble, Beechamwell, 444;
 Flat head, or lintel, 81, 104, 140 f.
 Arch of Triumph or Sanctuary arch, 97, 104, 110, 153, 173, 218.
 Arcosolia (recesses or chambers opening out of crypts); Brixworth, 112, Repton, 313, Wing, 322.
 Aula, Harold's at Bosham, 9; at Pagham, 9.
 Aumbries, in Deerhurst tower, 213, at Barnack, 282, at Skipwith, 332.
 Austrasia, etc., see Index III.
 BAPTISTRIES; Ch. Ch. Canterbury, 77*, 79; quasi, 211; conjectured, 194 n., 302, 329, 337 n., 353.
 Base-mouldings, see 'Plinths.'
 Bases (see also Index III), plain round slabs chamfered above, Repton crypt, 314; with hollow chamfer, Deerhurst, 214*, plain conical, Wittering, 400*; elaborate, Bracebridge, 413, Fig. 192, vii, nondescript, Bosham, 401*, bulbous, in Saxon surroundings, Appleton-le-Street, 422.
 Basilicas, Saxon: plan not favoured by Saxons, 434, favoured by Early Christians, 63, and Normans, 64, 233, 434;
 Existing, Brixworth, 106 f.*, Wing, 322*, Great Paxton, 369;
 Ruined, Reculver, 96, Lydd, 321*;
 Attested, Ch. Ch. Canterbury, 77*, Ripon, 148, Hexham, 167, York, 383, Ramsey, 383.
 Belfry openings, see 'Openings,' and Index III.
 'Big stone' quoins, see Quoins, 'big stone.'
 Billet ornament: a Norman feature, 432 f.;
 Used in Saxon surroundings, Dunham Magna, 346, Haddiscoe, 455, Hernefleet, 459, Sompting, 430 f., Great Paxton, 433.
 Bricks, Roman, re-used by Saxons: St Martin Canterbury, 81, St Pancras, 84, Reculver, 96, St Peter-on-the-Wall, 102, Brixworth, 107, Titchfield, 194, Britford, 222, Dover, 354, Trinity Church Colchester, 449, Lower Halstow, 456, Jevington, 461, Leicester, 465, Stoke d'Abernion, 480, Swanscombe, 482;
 Voussoir-shaped, 66, 223;

- Faulty placing of at crowns of arches, 424 f., 456, 464, 483.
- Buttresses: not used at angles of Saxon towers, 20, distinct from pilaster strips, 26, 238 f.;
- In early churches of the Kentish type, 239, St Martin, 82, St Pancras, 84, Reculver, 98*, St Peter-on-the-Wall, 102* f., Brixworth, 110;
- As later additions, 20, Hainton, 455, Heapham, 458, Nettleton, 473, Strethall, 481;
- Their place taken by pilaster strips, 239;
- Pieces to strengthen re-entrant angles, N Elmham, 344*.
- CABLE MOULDINGS**, on Saxon work, Monkwearmouth, 125 f., Somerford Keynes, 189, Heysham Church, 309 n., Boarhunt, 309* f., Breamore, 351*.
- Caen stone, in Saxon surroundings, 194 n., balusters at Dover, 265, at Norwich, 266.
- 'Cancelli,' 178, (choir enclosures), 258.
- Capitals: Romano-Saxon from Reculver, 97 f., 384*;
- Saxon and Saxo-Norman, passim;
- Figures and animals wanting, leafage debased, 408;
- Plain conical, Wittering, 400*; non-descript, Bosham, 400, Deerhurst, 188*, 217;
- Cubical from Brixworth, probably fortuitous, 255;
- Tectonic, from cube or parallelepiped, 255, 409 f.;
- Crude attempts to get down from square to octagon or circle, Repton, Broughton, Wharram-le-Street, Marton, St Mary Lincoln, Wing, etc., 409 f.;
- Cubical form reached, mitred cushion caps, scalloped caps, Clee, Rothwell, Bracebridge, Branston, etc., 411 f.;
- Tectonic, from cylinder or sphere, 414 f.; bulbous, Great Paxton, 415*;
- Resembling the base of the shaft, Bosham, 400, Wittering, 400*;
- Saxo-Norman forms, Ionic or volute, 409 f., 430*, Corinthianesque, with upright leaves, or cigar-shaped enrichments derived from these, or 'Jew's harp' ornament, 412, 448, Fig. 192 passim;
- Austrasian origin possible for some of the above, 430;
- Corbel caps, general, 247* f., 407, Glentworth, 413, Sompting, 432, Monk Fryston, 470, etc.
- Celtic elements, in Saxon buildings, 46, 188, in ornament, 212.
- Cement and concrete, Saxon: good quality of, 23, 57 f., 82, 96, 270;
- At St Augustine, 92. See also 'Plaster.'
- Centering, flat wooden, 423; flat stone, 423.
- Central churches: at Canterbury, 87, 182, 371 f.; at Hexham, 181 f.; at Athelney, 182, 196, 372; doubtful example at Abingdon, 372 n.; [Norman example at Hereford, 237].
- Chair, Pontifical, at Hexham, 178*, at Canterbury, 78 n.
- Chambers, in towers, 330 f., and passim, connected with crypts, 163, above porch, 125.
- Chamfer: straight; Roman, Saxon and Norman, passim;
- Quirked; specially Norman, 31, etc.; Saxon, Deerhurst Chapel, 31, 405* f., Oxford, St Michael, 475, etc.;
- Hollow; not a Norman profile, 442, but Saxon; at Deerhurst, 214*, Billingham, 406, Monkwearmouth, 471, etc., St Michael Oxford, 475, etc.; Saxo-Norman, Marton, 470.
- Chancels, Saxon, square ended: the normal form, 44; influence on it of Celtic tradition, 44 f., of English weakness in vaulting, 65;
- Existing Saxon square E ends, rare, 291; examples, Barton-on-Humber, 291*, Barrow, 443, Boarhunt, 309*, Bradford-on-Avon, 296*, N Burcombe, 445, Clayton, 448, Daglingworth, 450, Deerhurst Chapel, 307 f., Dover, 352*, Escomb, 136 f., Fareham, 453, Heysham Chapel, 43*, 187 f., Kingsbury, 462, Kirk Hamerton, 462, Repton, 313*, Sidbury, 478, Stanton-by-Bridge, 479, Tichborne, 482, Wareham, 484, Weybourn, 485, Wittering, 487;
- Practically certain, Peterborough, 169*;
- Doubtful, Coln Rogers, 449, Breamore, 350 f.
- Cigar-shaped ornamental forms, 412.
- Collegiate churches, Saxon, 9; Stow, 355.

Columns. [This entry is common to Indices II and III].

Capitals, see 'Capitals' in Indices II and III:

Bases, see 'Bases,' *ibid* :

Shafts: Monumental; Roman monolithic, 58, re-used in churches, 97, St Pancras(?), 84 f., Chollerton, Lanchester, Ickleton, 58 f., 384*, 418; Roman, built up, Reculver(?); font cut out of, Wroxeter, 15;

Saxon; list of, 383, Reculver(?), 97 f., 384*, Repton, 316, 384*;

Norman, 382; German, 249;

Twisted, Repton, 315* f.

Small, for openings or supports; German, 247*, 249, 261; Roman, 59 f., 258 f., 276*; re-used in Saxon work, Wickham, 60*, 259; used decoratively as ornamental motive, 259* f.; the same motive in Saxon work, 260 f.;

Mid-wall shafts; German, 247*, Italian, 247, Saxon, 33 f., 247 f., 257 f., 407 f.;

Plain shafts with bellying outline; Roman, 60*, 263, Saxon, 33*, Bardsey, 264*, Worth, 33*, 264, Glentworth, 407, etc.;

Enriched shafts, Glentworth, 407, etc., St Andrews, 442;

Baluster shafts, lathe-turned; Roman, 59 f.; Early Saxon; Monkwearmouth, 124, 127 f., 257 f.*, Jarrow, 258*, Hart, 258, Wroxeter(?), 488, Durham Cathedral library, 258; Late Saxon, St Albans, 264* f., Dover, 266*, St Augustine, 266, Jevington, 461;

Hewn to shape; of X, Brixworth, 113, 262*, Barton-on-Humber, 34*, 262*, Earls Barton, 262*, 287*; later, Wing, Worth, 263* f., Whitby, 262 n., Oxford, St Michael, 475, etc.;

Continental, St Mesme by Chinon, Jumièges, 261 f.;

Angle shafts, Late Saxon, Hadstock, 365* f., Kirk Hammerton,

Kirkdale, 397*, Wittering, 400*; Bosham, 401*;

Saxo-Norman, Weaverthorpe, 420, Haddiscoe, 455, Herringfleet, 459, Langford, 463, Broughton, 292* f., etc.;

Soffit shafts; with soffit rolls, 397 f., not a characteristic Norman feature, 401;

Saxon examples, Clayton, St Botolph, 398 f.*, Wittering, Bosham, 399 f.*;

Saxo-Norman examples, Carlton-in-Lindrick, Stoughton, 400, Syston, 482, etc.

Concrete, see 'Cement and Concrete, Saxon.'

'Confessio,' 111.

Corners, see 'Quoins.'

Corbels: projecting stones not zooform, 205, 213, 332, 471; at angles of gables, 188*, for start of pilaster strips, 28*, 240, 276*, etc., for support of figures(?), 471;

Zooform corbels, see 'Πρόκροσσοι';

Corbel caps, see 'Capitals.'

Crosses: gable, Corbridge, 291*, Chichester, 270*; churchyard; xiii, 14 f., Hackness, 204, etc., fragments of, used in building Saxon churches, Barnack, 276, Billingham, 277, Beechamwell, 277, 407 f., Cranwell, 450, Hovingham, 460, Marton, 470.

Crypts, Saxon: Ch. Ch. Canterbury, 78, 79 f., Brixworth, 111 f., Ripon and Hexham, 160 f. and Chapter VI *passim*, Repton, 186, 212 f., Wing, 321 f., Sidbury, 323;

Their use for burials, 164 f.

Cruciform plans, see 'Plans.'

DECORATION, Architectural, xiii, 203:

Pictorial, Monkwearmouth, 128, Hexham, 153 f., 158, Witley, 487;

Sculpturesque, Monkwearmouth, 125*, Corbridge, 143, Hackness, Kirby Hill, Deerhurst, Britford, 203*-210*, Barnack, 273* f., Corhampton, 276*, Hadstock, 367*, St Benet, Cambridge, 446, Daglingworth, 450, Langford, 463, Ledsham, 464.

See also, 'Arcading,' 'Bases,'

'Cable Mouldings,' 'Capitals,'

'Corbels, Zooform,' 'Imposts, Enriched.'

Dimensions of Saxon churches, 21*, 384, and *passim*.

Doorways, see 'Openings.'
Double splayed windows, see 'Openings.'

EARTHWORKS, Saxon, Eddisbury, 7 n.,
Wareham, 7 n., 484.

Elongation of naves to W, Wroxeter,
435.

'Emporen,' see 'Galleries, over side
aisles.'

'Escomb fashion'; explanation of, 53*f.;
see 'Long and short work.'

FINISH to Saxon towers, saddle shape,
pyramidal, flat, in the form of the
German 'Helm,' 392.

Floorings, Saxon: Awebury, 37, Cor-
bridge, 146, etc.;

Pebble, Escomb, 142;

Plaster (concrete), Peterborough, 58,
170, Reculver, 96;

Stone, Hexham, 158, 171.

Fonts, Saxon; Deerhurst, Bingley, S Hay-
ling, Little Wilne, Wroxeter, Little
Billing, Potterne (some doubtful), 15,
Deerhurst, 178, 211*, Bishopstone (?),
194 n., Bradford-on-Avon (?), 302.

Forebuildings, Western:

Their use with W porches, Brixworth,
109, Monkwearmouth, 124, 472,
Escomb (?), 142;

With W towers, their origin at
Aachen, 234 f., 237;

At Deerhurst, 213, 220; Saxo-
Norman, Netheravon;

Their general employment, 329 f.,
337 f.

Fragments, carved, re-used in Saxon
building, see 'Crosses.'

Funereal churches, 90; funereal stones of
Hartlepool type, 468.

GABLES, acutely pointed, a Saxon
feature, 22, 47;

Examples, Monkwearmouth, 123, Es-
comb, 136, Corbridge, 145, Deer-
hurst, 216, Norton, 357, etc.

Galleries; Wooden, in naves, Deerhurst,
213, Tredington, 483;

Over side-aisles, 70, 179 f., York, 147,
Hexham, 152, 176, 179, Deerhurst
(?), 212.

Greek Cross plans, see 'Plans.'

HAGIOSCOPES, 163, 275; in Saxon crypts,
Ripon, 164, Repton, 313, Wing, 322.

Heads of openings; doorways, arched,
etc., see 'Arch construction';

Windows; arched, *ibid.*; cut out of
lintel, 35, 141*.

Helm, German, as finish to towers, Somp-
ting, St Benet Cambridge, 392*.

Herring-bone work; a Roman technique,
244; described, 8; assigned to Nor-
mans, 8, 244 f., etc.;

Classic example at Diddlebury, 245*;
Norman origin not exclusive; Saxon
(?) herring-boning at Deerhurst apse,
244, Monkwearmouth, 471, Stoke
d'Abernon, 480.

Hood mouldings: 210, 225, 274;

Starting from corbel stones, Barnack,
278, etc.;

From animals' heads, Deerhurst, 205,
213, 217;

Continuing pilaster strips, Britford, and
passim, as 'strip-work round open-
ings,' 226.

Horseshoeing of arches (connected with
arches set back on jambs, 29, and
keyhole openings, 35);

Saxon, Limpley Stoke, 30, 466, Bos-
ham, 67;

Norman, Winchester, N transept, etc.;

Saxo-Norman, Great Paxton, 367,
Wharram-le-Street, 421, Debenham,
451, Jevington, 461.

IMPOSTS: their use general but not uni-
versal, 31, 189;

Plain square, 32, 204, 405, etc.;

With sloped soffit, 27*, 32, 400*, 406;

Chamfered, see 'Chamfer';

Step-patterned, 32, 279 f*;

Enriched, 205*, 369*, 405*, 446;

With 'Anglian' carved ornament, xiii,
205*, 463.

Inscriptions: dedicatory; Jarrow, 134,
Deerhurst Chapel, 307 f., St Mary

Lincoln, 467, Weaverthorpe, 420;

Of uncertain purport, Bishopstone, 193,
Braemore, 351*;

On Roman stones re-used, 140 n., 162.

JAMBS: 'Escomb fashion,' see 'Long and
short work';

Inclined, 31, 46, 81, 141, 142, 189,
192, 210, 212, 302;

Monolithic, 222, 395*, 466,
(Roman), 50*;

Arch set back on, 29, 35, 81, 104, etc.;

Interest of them in Saxon work, 35;

Plans of: plain square, *passim*;

Splayed; doorways, 162*, 403, 484;
windows, *passim*;

- With three half-columns, 129, 399*, 400*; enriched with carving, 207*;
- With angle shafts, 292*, 365*, 397*, 401*;
- With angle shafts and soffit shafts, 399 f.

KEYSTONE, rare in Saxon work, 68.

'LISENEN,' their derivation and history, see Index III;

As sources of Saxon forms, see 'Pilaster strips.'

'Long and short' work: a specially Saxon feature, 25;

The technique on jambs, Roman and Byzantine, 53*;

Saxon, called 'Escomb fashion,' 54, 69, 146, at Monkwearmouth, 124*, Heysham Chapel, 188*, Somerford Keynes, 189, Hackness, 204, Earls Barton, 285, etc.; Saxo-Norman, at Great Paxton, 369, St Peter-at-Gowts, Lincoln, 388, Jevington, 462;

The technique on quoins; origin from the above, but early history obscure; possible transitional form at Heddon-on-the-Wall, 256, 458*; accidental appearances mistaken for, 257*;

General appearance and technique, 24* f., 55* f., its connection with plastering, 55;

Period of employment, 56, 267, 386, 389 f.*;

Survivals in Norman surroundings, Stow, 427*, Cholsey, 426;

Examples in Saxon work, passim.

MANOR HOUSE, Saxon, 8.

Megalithic feeling in Saxon work, see 'Anglo-Saxon architecture.'

Moated mounds, not pre-Conquest, 8.

Mortar, see also 'Cement,' and 'Plaster,' pink, 82, white, 82, yellow, 84.

Mortising of sills and lintels, 50*, 140* f., 222.

Mouldings: Roman re-used, 407, 441, 484;

Saxon, see 'Bases,' Billet Ornament, 'Cable Mouldings,' 'Capitals,' 'Chamfer,' 'Hood Mouldings,' 'Imposts,' 'Plinths,' 'String Courses.'

Multiplication of churches in monasteries, 135.

NECK MOULDINGS common on mid-wall shafts, 413.

Niches, see 'Aumbries.'

OPENINGS, Saxon: general treatment of the subject, 26-37, 53-57, 65-70, 246-266; narrowness characteristic, 70;

(1) Openings cut straight through walls, in form of

(a) Small apertures; for observation, Deerhurst Tower, 212, 335*, Bosham, 334* f.; for other purposes, Barnack, etc., 402;

(b) Multiform apertures; in belfries, Earls Barton, 287; in walls, 33*, 112*, 214*, 264;

(2) Doorways, including tower and chan- cel arches;

(a) Cut straight through walls, 30, with (early) a rebate for a door, and (later) no rebate save as modern addition, 30,

(b) With splayed jambs (exceptional), Hexham Crypt, 162*, Warden, 403, 484,

(c) With sloping jambs, see 'Jambs,'

(d) Construction of jambs of, see 'Jambs,'

(e) Imposts of, see 'Imposts,'

(f) Heads of, see 'Heads of openings, doorways,'

(g) Voussoirs of, see 'Arch construction, voussoirs';

(3) Windows; (a) single; cut straight through walls, Earls Barton, 287, slightly splayed, of wide Early Christian form, Brixworth, 108, St Peter-on-the-Wall, 103 f., Deerhurst, 210 f.,

(b) Double, see above 'Multiform apertures,' and 32 f., 246 f.,

(c) Internally splayed (early and late), passim,

(d) With sloping jambs, 31*, etc.,

(e) Circular, Bosham, 436*, Arretton, 442, Hardwicke, 457, etc.,

(f) Double splayed, 35* f., their history, 250 f., not a Norman form, 252, position of aperture, 289, in work of Period 3, passim, late examples in East Anglia, 422 f., 473,

(a) High placing of, 201, (b) partial closing of, Jarrow, 203;
 (i) Circular, Avebury, 36*, etc.,
 (i) small apertures, Godalming, 454.
 Orientation, Westward, Silchester (Romano-British), 61*, Ch. Ch. Canterbury (do.), 79, Ripon (?), 164.
 Ostiarius, or sacristan, 331.

PAINTING, paintings, in churches, 129, 153, 154, 158. See also 'Decoration.'
 Passages and stairways in Saxon walls, 177.

Pavement, see 'Flooring.'

Pierced work, on transennae, 35;

In stone, E Lexham, Earls Barton, Billingham, 35, Barnack, 273 f.*, its origin here, 275;

In wood, Barton-on-Humber, Birstall, Stevington, 36.

Pilasters, pilaster strips, Saxon: derived from Lisenen (see Index III), 238 f.; not Norman, 241; their distinction from buttresses, 26, 238 f.; their connection with arcading, 241 f.;

Chronological value of, 222;

Geographical distribution of, 243;

Unique Norman example of, Milborne Port, 241, 428, 470;

Fluted, 214*, stepped, 243, reeded, 215 n., with 'cabling', 214*;

Starting; from corbels, 28*, 240, 392, etc., from top of arches, 240, 284, from string courses, 240, 309;

Ending; at string courses, 364, 443; in arches; round, 284, 288, 315, 321, straight sided, 284, 288, 321, 453;

Bisecting gables, Kirkdale, Boarhunt, 309, Sompting, St Benet Cambridge, 392;

At corners, Tichborne, 482;

Elements in 'strip-work round openings', 225 f.;

Widths of, Earls Barton, 4 in., Woolbeding, 7 in., Deerhurst Apse, 7 in., Hambledon, 8 in., Breamore, 11 in., Langford, 12½ in., Tichborne (exceptional), 13 in. and 24 in.

Plans, planning, of Saxon churches: variety in them, 327 f.;

Plain aisleless oblong, without lateral adjuncts (of Celtic tradition); without altar house, Heysham Chapel, 43*, 187 f.;

With square ended presbytery, Es-

comb, 136 f., etc. (not exclusively Celtic), 65;

With apsidal presbytery, Lyminge, 95, Rochester, 96*;

Aisleless nave with lateral 'porticus,' St Pancras Canterbury;

Development of lateral porticos into transepts, 328 f.; Britford, 221*, Breamore, 349*, Deerhurst, 209*, Repton, 313*, Dover, 352*, Stow, 356*, Norton, 356, etc.;

Aisleless nave with fully developed transepts, 'Tau' or 'Crux Commissa' plan, 168, 374, Peterborough, 169*;

Greek Cross plan, 196, 374*;

Cruciform plan without aisles, Worth, 363*, etc.;

Cruciform plan with aisles, Great Paxton, 368 f.;

Cruciform plan regarded as symbolic, 269;

Basilican plan with aisles, 64, see 'Basilicas, Saxon.'

Plaster, cement, and mortar, Saxon use of, 37, 55, 57 f.;

Its excellence, 23, 57;

On walls, 147, 171, etc.;

On floors, 58, 170;

Red (opus signinum), 82, 96;

Whitewashed, Candida Casa, 44, Winterton, 486.

Plinths, Saxon: at the foot;

Of external walls, 23*, 284, 298*, 343, 355, 388*, 391*, 406, etc.;

Of internal walls, Bradford-on-Avon, 302;

Of openings, 274* f., 365* f., 401, 404, 407, etc.

Porches, Lateral, Side chapels and Transepts: their importance in Anglo-Saxon architecture, 70, 373, confused use of them, 373: at Hexham, Ch. VI, passim;

Examples, 77*, 81*, 83* f., 88, 102, 110, 193*, 208*, 217, 221*, 296*, 313*, 338*, 345*, 349*, 353*, 355*, 356 f., 361*, 363*, 365 f., 368, etc.

With upper stories (Deerhurst), 217.

Porches, Western, 84, 103, 114, 124 f., 191, 194, 213, 321 (?).

Porch-towers, 58, 77, 80, 85, 109, 114, 145, 191, 193, 194, 330.

'Porticus,' meanings of the word, 88 f.

'Porticus Ingressus,' 89 n., 330.
Pre-Augustinian (British or partly Saxon) churches, 78, 80.

Πρόκορροι (projecting stones or corbels), 188 f., 205* f.:

Zooform; Saxon, 206, 210, 213, 217;
Norman, 206; of Viking importation (?), 206.

Proportions in Saxon architecture:

In ground plans, 20, 21*, 47, 132, 136, 137, 188, 221, 418 (Saxo-Norman), etc.;

In elevations, 20, 47, 123, 132, 136, 137, 191, 201, 302, etc.; alterations due to later clearstories, 20;

Of towers, 20, 130, 191, 210, 389, etc.;

Of openings, 27, see 'Openings';
Of chancels, 134, 137, 290, 453, etc.;

Exceptional proportions; in Saxon and Saxo-Norman towers, Appleton-le-Street, 421, Harpswell, 457, 468, Jevington, 461, St Benedict Lincoln, 466, 468;

In Norman towers, 388, 419, Monkwearmouth (Saxo-Norman), 420, Weaverthorpe, 420.

QUOINING, quoins, 24 f.: Romans and Normans not particular about, 46, 390;

Saxon quoining expressive of Megalithic feeling, 46, 137, 391;

'Big stone' quoins, 25, 123, 194, 357*, Roman stones for, 25, 93 f.*, 103*, 191;

'Stow fashion' explained, 25, examples, passim;

Long and short quoins, see 'Long and short work.'

RAMPARTS, Town, Saxon, 7.

Rebates for doors; 32, 37, 124, 141, 192, 224; cut in later time, 30, 190 (?); for shutters, 37.

Recessing of arches: occasional in Saxon work, 29; a Norman fashion, 29, 246, 401, etc.;

Examples; Saxon, Kirk Hammerton, Kirkdale, 397*, 462;

Saxo-Norman, Broughton, 292*, Clee, 396, St Mary Bishophill Junr., York, 403, etc.

Roman stones, large, re-used, 24, 93*, 103*, 140, 150, 162, 191, etc.

Roods, Barton-on-Humber (over E door from tower), 294, Bradford-on-Avon, 304*, Breamore, 351, Headborne Worthy, 458, Monkwearmouth, 471, Walkern, 483.

Roofs, Saxon, high pitched, see 'Gables';
External coating, 145, 202;
Finish of towers, see 'Towers.'

SALTIREs, 143, 481.

Screen of columns before presbytery, 84, 97, 99, 100, 104, 110.

Shutters, wooden, Avebury (rebates for), 37, Boarhunt, 310, Houghton-on-the-Hill, 460.

Soffit shafts and rolls, see 'Columns.'

'Solaria,' 147, 177, see 'Galleries.'

Spiral ornament, 212.

Stairways, in Saxon walls, 177.

Staples, iron, for doors, 30.

Step pattern, origin and connections, 32, 280, examples, 189, 214, 281*.

Stone carved structural features or fragments, Lastingham, 16, Hexham, 153, 178, Hackness, Kirby Hill, 204*, Deerhurst, 206*, etc., 219*, Britford, 207*, Barnack, 275*, etc., Corhampton, 276*, Bradford-on-Avon, 304*.

Stone carvings non-architectural, xiii, 133, 190, 204, 273, 450. See also 'Crosses.'

String courses, horizontal:

On Saxon churches of Period A, Monkwearmouth, 125, 126, 471 (hollow chamfered);

On churches of Period C, Bradford-on-Avon, 298, Kirkdale, 308, Boarhunt, 308*, Repton, 317, Stanton Lacy, 360, Barholme, 362 n., Wroxeter, 488, etc. (all these square sectioned);

On towers, 20, passim, but not universal.

'Strip-work round openings,' explained, 29, 225 f., examples, passim.

Sundials, Saxon, 15, 137, 193, 276*, 308, 450, 480.

THICKENING OF WALLS FOR AXIAL OR CENTRAL TOWERS, 343, 373;

Walls thickened, S Elmham (Norman or Saxo-Norman), 311*, 343, Hooton Pagnell (do.), 343, N Elmham, 344*, Daglingworth, 342, 450, Dunham Magna, 347*, Hadstock, 365, Northchurch, 473, Stow, 356*;

Walls not thickened but tower certain ; Barton-on-Humber, 291* (tower same thickness, 2 ft. 6 in., as W adjunct and chancel), Breamore, 349*, Dover, 352* ;
 Walls not thickened and tower not certain, Deerhurst, 208*, Boarhunt, 309*, Repton, 313*, Great Paxton, 370.
 Through-stones, as imposts in mid-wall work, 34, not capitals, 248, as voussoirs, 28, 68, with camouflaged mortar joints, 28 n.
 Timber building, light, 41, 57, 146, half-timber work, 198, block, 38, 198, no influence on stone construction, 198.
 Timber churches, Saxon, 16, 41, 146, 187, 198, Norse, 41, 197.
 Tombstones, Saxon, 15. See also 'Crosses.'

[The entries under 'Towers' follow as a rule the numerical order of the pages. The entries serve also for Index III.]

Towers, Saxon: xiv f., 20, 328 ;
 Later towers added to earlier churches, Ch. Ch. Canterbury, 77 f., Brixworth, 107 f., Monkwearmouth, 126, 126 f., Jarrow, 133, Corbridge, 145, Bardsey, 191 f. ;
 Earliest towers in England, 434 ;
 Towers over porches, 193, 330, Titchfield, 194. See also 'Porch-towers' ;
 Irish round towers of defence, 199 ; E Anglian and 'Lincolnshire' (see 386) towers not defensive, 199 f. ;

Origin, history, and architectural placing of towers in W Christendom, 232-234 ;

Influence of W forebuilding at Aachen on the single W tower in Mid-Europe and England, 234-238 ;

Towers in X, Brixworth, 113 f., Deerhurst, 208 f., Ramsey, 268, St Augustine Canterbury, 94, Barnack, Earls Barton, Barton-on-Humber, 271-291 ;

Various positions of towers, 328 ;

Ecclesiology of the W tower, 330-339 ;
 Axial towers, explained, 340 n., treated, 340-348 ;

Lateral towers, 340, Stoughton, 329, 419 ;

Central towers, 348-372, Breamore,

349*, Dover, 352*, Stow, 356*, Norton, 357*, Wootton Waven, 360* f. Doubtful cases, Stanton Lacy, Deerhurst, Repton, Hadstock, Great Paxton.

Architecture of Saxon and Saxo-Norman W towers, 385-437 ;

Square spaces as possible bases for towers, 216 ;

Norman proportions of towers, normal, 388, 419, 421, exceptional, 388 ;
 Saxon proportions taken over by Normans, 329, 380, 385 f., 419.

Transitional forms between Periods I and III, 215.

Turrets, Half-round stair, 338, Brixworth, 107*, 114, Broughton, 291, Hough-on-the-Hill, 295, N Elmham, 345*.

UNDERCUTTING, Barton-on-Humber, 99.

VAULTS: Anglo-Saxon, 70, 110 ; barrel, 70, 124, 131, 161 ; half-barrel, 161 ; groined, 70, 316 ; straight sided, 162. See also Index III.

Viking influence, see Index III.

Village churches, Saxon, vi, 9, and passim.

Volutes, see 'Capitals.'

Voussoirs, see 'Arch construction.'

WALLS, Saxon: their probable derivation, 68 ; their variety in technique and materials, 22 ; their thinness, 23, 68, 177, 244, 421 ;

Statistics of thickness of Saxon walls ;

St Pancras Canterbury, 84, 1 ft. 9 in., Hackness, 204, 2 ft., Ampney St Peter, 67, 2 ft., Monkwearmouth, 121 (nave and porch the base of a tower), c. 2 ft., Bardsey, 192 (do. do.), 2 ft. 1 in., Bishopstone Porch, 194, c. 2 ft. 1 in., Jevington, 461 (W wall), 2 ft. 1 in., Strethall, 481, 2 ft. 2½ in., Ovingham, 474, 2 ft. 3 in., St Martin Canterbury, 81, 2 ft. 2 in., Coln Rogers, 449 (E wall), 2 ft. 2 in., Sockburn-on-Tees, 69*, 2 ft. 3 or 4 in., Escomb, 137, 2 ft. 3 or 4 in., Diddlebury, 245, 2 ft. 3 or 4 in., Wootton Waven (tower), 360, 2 ft. 3 or 4 in., Weaverthorpe (Saxo-Norman), 421, 2 ft. 4 in., Limpley Stoke, 466, 2 ft. 5 in., Bradford-on-Avon, 298, 2 ft. 5 in., Heysham Chapel and Church, 189,

- 2 ft. 5 in., Kirby Hill, 205, 2 ft. 6 in., St Peter-on-the-Wall, 102, 2 ft. 6 in., Stoke d'Abernon, 480, 2 ft. 7 in., Hexham, 172, 2 ft. 6 to 8 in., Peterborough, 170, 2 ft. 8 in., Deerhurst Tower, 208, 2 ft. 8 in., Singleton Tower, 478, 2 ft. 8 in., Tredington, 483, 2 ft. 10 in., St Mildred Canterbury, 447, over 3 ft., Pattishall, 475, 3 ft. 3 in., Hardwicke, 456, 3 ft. 3 or 4 in., Earls Barton Tower, 284, 4 ft.;
- Alphabetical order of the above, Ampney St Peter, Bardsey, Bishopstone, Bradford-on-Avon, Coln Rogers, Deerhurst, Diddlebury, Earls Barton, Escomb, Hackness, Hardwicke, Hexham, Heysham, Jevington, Kirby Hill, Limpley Stoke, St Martin Canterbury, St Mildred do., Monkwearmouth, Ovingham, St Pancras Canterbury, Pattishall, St Peter-on-the-Wall, Peterborough, Singleton, Sockburn, Stoke d'Abernon, Strethall, Tredington, Weaverthorpe, Wootton Wawen.
- Wareham, Saxon earthworks, 7.
- Watching chambers, in towers, 213, 334* f., 402, etc.
- Whitewash, Saxon (Winterton), 486.
- Windows, see 'Openings, Saxon.'

INDEX III

GENERAL INDEX

- AACHEN, Minster at, 181, 215, 234 f., 340, 372, 375.
 Abingdon, Early Saxon settlement near, 38, Abbey, 116 f., 233, 372.
 Abinger, 14.
 Acca, Bp. of Hexham, Ch. VI, passim.
Acta Sanctorum, quoted, 195.
 Adamy, *Die Einhard-Basilika*, 101 n.
 Ælbert or Æthelbert, of York, 147.
 Aelred of Rievaulx, Ch. VI, passim.
 Æthelbert, King, 85, 88, 186, 228.
 Æthelwold, Bp. of Winchester, 272, 372 n.
 Aisles, Aisled churches, see 'Basilicas.'
 Albans, St, Abbey Church, 187, 264, 380, St Michael, 440.
 Albury, 14.
 Alcuin, 119, 147, 155, 186, 228.
 Aldhelm, 195, 477.
 Alfred the Great, his architectural work, 182, 196, 372, 375.
 Allen, J. Romilly, his *Monumental History of the British Church*, referred to, 97 n.
 Altars, see Index II.
 Anderson, Dr Joseph, referred to, 303 n.
 Anglo-Saxon architecture, see Index II.
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, quoted, 201, 272, referred to, 96 n.
Antiquaries Journal, 212, 270.
 Antiquaries, Society of, *Proceedings*, 487.
Antiquary, The, 194 n.
 Appareil, grand, 49, petit, 49, 116, 132.
 Apse, apses: of Roman origin, 64, not Celtic, 64, not universal on the Continent, 435;
 Pre-Saxon in England, Silchester, 61, Ch. Ch. Cathedral at Canterbury, 78 f., St Martin (?), *ibid.*, 81;
 Western, Silchester, 62, Canterbury, 78 f.;
 Duplication of, 80, a specially German feature, 233;
 Norman, in greater churches, 435; in smaller churches, 310; favoured, but not universal, 435;
 Saxon, see Index II.
 Arcades: cut by Normans; through Saxon walls, 12, 419, 433; through earlier Norman walls, 440;
 Later, through Saxon walls, passim.
 Arcading, decorative, on external walls;
 Early Christian, 301, Carolingian or Early Romanesque, 301, Lombardo-Norman (Rivoira), 302. See also Index II.
Archaeologia, quoted, 89, 308 n., 441 f., referred to, xiv, 13, 17, 57, 59, 62, 91, 101 n., 104, 371 n., 420, 423 n., 441, 442, 465, 472, 476, 485.
Archaeologia Cantiana, quoted, 58, 89, referred to, 76, 87, 95, 96, 97.
 Archaeological Institute, volumes of, Lincoln, 467, Norwich, 346, Winchester, 320, 330, 383.
Archaeological Journal, quoted, 59, 336 n., 354, referred to, 1, 98 n., 115, 212, 218, 233, 293, 312 n., 321, 350, 382 n., 423 n., 460.
Architecture Religieuse, Periode Romane, see 'Lasteyrie, de.'
 Ashington (and other forms of the word), 306 f.
 Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, 307.
 Asser, quoted, 196.
Associated Societies Reports, quoted, 454, referred to, 110 n., 355, 467.
Association, British Archaeological, Journal of, quoted, 58, referred to, 71, 170, 277 n., 282 n., 314 n., 423 n.
 Athelney, Alfred's church at, 182, 196, 372, 375.
 Atkinson and Clark, *Cambridge, etc.*, 447.
 Atrium, forecourt of Early Christian Church, 329. See also Index II, 'Fore-buildings, Western.'

Augustine, St, Abbey at Canterbury, 90, 99, 135, 273, 371.
 Ault Hucknall, Derbyshire, 394.
 Austin Canons, at Hexham, 157 f., in Yorkshire, 441.
 'Austrasia' and 'Neustria,' explained, 227 f.
 Austrasian models possible for Late Saxon features, 430.
 Austrasian Romanesque, 6, 80, 231, Ch. IX, *passim*, 376, 430 f.

BAPTISTRY, 79, at Nocera, 247, at Parenzo, 329 n.

Barr Hill, caps from, 99 n., 254.

Bases; Roman, 58, 99, 384*, 441; Norman, with two hollows, Hexham, 175, 414, Broughton, 414, Fig. 193, 2, bulbous, Norman (?), 416, Rivoira on, 416. See Index II.

Basilicas, Early Christian, 62 f., 70, at Silchester, 61 f., Roman, 58, 117, Saxon, see Index II; favoured in Normandy, 64, 233, 434.

Basse Œuvre at Beauvais, 174.

Bayeux tapestry, 9, 198, 437.

Bede, quoted, 71 f., 88, 119, 128, 149, 179, 330, referred to, 4, 41, 71, 73, 78, 90, 95, 96 n., 146, 150, 164.

Benedict Biscop, 119, 131, 228.

Bengeo, 35.

Bernay, 375, 401.

Bernward of Hildesheim, 376 n.

Bertha, 76, 88.

Bidford-on-Avon, Saxon cemetery at, 131.

Billing, Little, 15.

Binchester (Vinovium), 140.

Bingley, 15.

Bishop Auckland, 136.

Bloxam, M. H., referred to, 1, 18.

Bond, Francis, on fonts, 16.

Boothby Pagnal, 410, 414.

Bricks, Roman: re-used by Normans, Great Hallingbury, Tollesbury, 456; by Saxons, see Index II, 'Bricks, etc.'

Brickwork, Roman, 51, 57; bricks in voussoir form, 57, 66.

Bridges, Roman, 56.

Bristol and Gloucestershire Arch. Soc. Trans., 340.

British churches (pre-Saxon), 72, 447, 480.

Brompton, Yorks., carved stones at, 275.

Builder, *The*, xii, 98 n., 178.

'Burh,' see 'Earthworks, Norman.'

Burnham Deepdale, Norfolk, 423.

Butterworth, Rev. G., on Deenhurst, 208, 216.

Buttresses, 238 f.: Norman, 116, 240*; later, 20, 455, 458, 473, 481.

— 'by' district of Lincolnshire, 391.

CABLE MOULDING; Roman; 259*; modern (?), 309 n.

Cabrol, Dom F., *Dictionnaire d'Ant. Chrét.*, x, 305 n.

Cædmon, 39.

Caen stone, see Index II.

Cambridge Ant. Soc., *Communications*, 368 n.

Cambridge Mediaeval History, 185 f.

Campanili, Italian, 2.

Candida Casa, 44.

Canterbury; 71, 183, 187; Church of Four Crowned Martyrs at, 73 n.

'Capella,' Chapel, 17, 310 n.

Capitals, 252 to 255, 407 to 416 (see also Figs. 192, 193, 194):

Classical; Grecian Doric, 253; Roman, 58, 60*, 97 f., 99 n., 252, 254, 384*.

Byzantine, at Constantinople, 253;

Lombardic, 253; Norse, from woodwork, 253;

Carolingian (Roman reproductions), 252;

Romanesque, Early; belated Corinthianesque, 408; Ionic or volute, 409; tectonic, 408 (253 f.);

Romanesque, Developed;

Norman, volute (Ionic), 254, 409, 429 f.; cubical or cushion, its history, 252 f., mitred, 411, scalloped, 411, 'Tau,' 413; bulbous, 416; with upright leaves (Corinthianesque), 429 f., with cigar-shaped enrichments derived from leaves, or 'Jew's harp' ornament, 412, 448;

Austrasian parallels to some of these, 430.

Carolingian; connections with Saxon England, 228 f., 377; architecture, 230 f.; acanthus ornament, 275, 463.

Cedd, 101.

Cement, mortar, and plaster; Roman, 57, 82, 84; Irish use of, 44. See also Index II.

Cerisy-la-Forêt, 401, 416.

Chad, St, of Lichfield, 187.

Chalmers, Macgregor, LL.D., 451.
 Chambers: Vaulted sepulchral; at Trier, 161 n.; at Rome, 163; in Gaul, 163;
 In roofs in Ireland, 335.
 Champneys, A. C., *Irish Ecclesiastical Architecture*, quoted, 46, referred to, 44.
 Chanceau-sur-Choisille, 132.
 Chancel arches, Celtic, compared with Saxon, 303 n.
 Charles the Great, 227 f.
 Chesters, see 'Cilurnum.'
 Chichester, seal with representation of building, 270*.
 Chinon, St Mesme, by, 261 f.
 Chipping Ongar, 39.
 Chollerford, 56.
 Chollerton, 58, 384.
 Cholsey, 426, 448.
Chronicle of Lanercost, quoted, 159.
Chronicon Abbatiae Ramesiensis, quoted, 268, referred to, 320, 383.
Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon, referred to, 116 f., 372 n.
 Chronology of Anglo-Saxon buildings, vii, 1 f., 15, 23, 70, 271, 325 f., 422, 439, Ch. XIV, passim.
 Cilurnum (Chesters), 49, 56 f.
 Circular windows, their history, 34. See also Index II, 'Openings, windows.'
 Cnut, his building activity, 306, his connection with Ashington, 306 f., 365, his marriage with the Norman Emma, 378.
 Coinage, Saxon, 196, 204, 227, 272 n., 377.
 Coldingham, 39.
 Colsuain, 467.
 Columnar edifices, Roman, 58.
 Columns, Roman, 58, 86.97 f.(?), Fig. 174.
 Compton, 336.
 Concrete, Roman, 57.
 Confessio, Confessional, 111.
 Corbelling out of Celtic roofs, 47.
 Corfe Castle, 8.
 Corstopitum, 50, 140, 142, 150.
 Cotswold churches, 395.
 Crosses, carved, Anglo-Saxon, 14;
 Fragments of, built into Saxon and Saxo-Norman walls, see Index II, 'Crosses.'
 Crypts: Early Christian, Jouarre, 320;
 Early Norman at Oxford, 319, at York, 489;
 Hallenkrypten, 323;
 Italian, 324.

Culbone, 16.
 Cuxwold, 16.
 DANES, the, 131.
 Darenth, 335.
 Dehio u. von Bezold, *Kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes*, referred to, 100 n., 147, 177 n., 236, 430 n., 435.
Derbyshire Archaeological Journal, 314 n.
Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne, referred to, x, 305 n.
 Dome of the Rock, Jerusalem, 182.
 Domesday, xiv, 13, 14, 385, 467.
 Dorter, at Westminster, 410.
 Dowker, George, 97.
 Dryden, Sir Henry, quoted, 434, referred to, 110 n., 481.
 Dugdale, *Monasticon*, quoted, 39, 355.
 Dunstan, St, 89 n., 93; his place of burial, 164.
 Dunstan, St, Church of, at Canterbury, 447.
 Dunraven, Lord, on Irish oratories, 460.
 Durham, Saxon Cathedral at, 381.
Durrov, Book of, 280.
 EARTHWORKS, Norman, 8, 343, 417, 463, Saxon, 7, 484.
 East Anglia: architectural peculiarities of, 343 f., 422;
 Isolated towers in, 232;
 Survival of double splayed windows in, 422, 473 f. (Norwich cloister).
 Ecclesia, Ecclesiola, 17.
 Eddius, quoted, 148, referred to, 105, 373, and Ch. VI, passim.
 Edgar, King: his reforms, 4, 113, 477; source of, 267.
 Edlingham, 200.
 Edmund Ironside at Ashington, 306 f.
 Edston, Great, 15.
 Edward the Elder, coins of, 272 n.
 Edwin of Northumbria, 146.
 Effmann, on buildings at Werden a. d. Ruhr, 89 n., 294.
 Eginhard, his basilica, 330.
 Eilaf I and II, at Hexham and Durham, Ch. VI, passim.
 Eilean Naomh, 43.
 Elfrid or Alured Westowe, of Durham, 158 n.
 Elmham, S, Suffolk, 310, 343, 345, 373.
 Ely Cathedral, its towers, 270, 383, 417.
Encomium Emmae, cited, 306.
 Encorbellment, roofing by, 47.
 Entasis, of columns, 98.

- Etschmiadzin, Gospels of, carved ivory cover, 304.
 Exedra, use of the word, 90 n.
 Exeter, seal with representation of building, 269*.
- FLORENCE OF WORCESTER, quoted, 306 f.
 Fonts, Little Billing, Bingley, Culbone, Cuxwold, Deerhurst, S Hayling, Littlehampton, Potterne, Selham, Selsworthy, Shepton Mallet, Walberton, Little Wilne, Wroxeter, 15 f.
Fonts and Font Covers, by Francis Bond, 16.
 Fowler, Canon, 487.
 Fox, G. E., quoted, 59, referred to, 98.
 Framingham Pigot, Norfolk, 16.
 Freeman, E. A.: his *English Towns and Districts*, 298 n.; his *Norman Conquest*, 467; in *Arch. Journ.*, 382, 460.
 French churches, early, 132, 201, 243 f.
 Friar's Island, 43.
 Fulda, 117.
 Funereal churches, 90; stones of 'Hartlepool' type, 468.
 Fursa, 102.
- GALL, ST, Plan of, 117, 183.
 Galleries, not in Early Christian basilicas, 70, but added later, 180; in central and domed churches, 180; in the East, 180; in Romanesque churches, 70.
 Gallowhead, Lewis, 43.
 Garvelloch Islands, 43.
 Gaul, 128, 149.
 Générout, St, Poitou, 368.
Gentleman's Magazine, referred to, 89 n., 126, 355 n.
 Gernrode, in Saxony, 230, 241* f., 301, 414.
Gesta Pontificum, quoted, 187, 195, 196 n., 237, 297, 381, referred to, 150, 175, 230 n.
Gesta Regum, quoted, 378.
 Gibson, John Pattison, of Hexham, 146, 167.
 Giles, St, Edinburgh, 177.
 Glass, work in, 128, 228.
 Goodmanham, Yorks., 294.
Gospels of Lindisfarne, 132.
 Green, J. R., referred to, 229.
 Greenwell, Canon, 136.
 Gsell, *Monuments antiques de l'Algérie*, referred to, 62, 79.
- HACKNESS, Anglian cross at, 204.
 Hagiolatry, mediaeval, 90 f., 165.
- Hagioscopes, 163, 323.
 Haigh, Father, 457.
 Half-timber work, 57, 198.
Handbuch der Architectur, 215.
 Harold, 378, 437.
 Hatfield, Herefordshire, 395*.
 Hayling, South, 15.
 Henry of Huntingdon, 201.
 'Heorternysse,' 457.
 Hereford, Norman central church at, 237.
 Herring-bone work, see Index II.
Hexham Courant, *The*, 165 n., 175 n.
 'Hexham School,' 207.
 Hipkins, Rev. G., on Repton, 312 f.
 Hild, 39.
Historia Dunelmensis Ecclesiae, quoted, 130, 382.
Historia Monasterii S. Augustini, quoted, 76 n.
Historia Regum, referred to, 147 n.
Historians of the Church of York, quoted, 147, 148, 269, 383, referred to, 105, and Ch. VI, *passim*.
History of Northumberland, quoted, 150, 157.
 Hodgson Fowler, his architectural work, 290, 463, quoted, 454.
 Hooton Pagnell, 310, 343, 373.
 Hope, Sir W. St John, quoted, 89, referred to, 76, 91, 95, 371 n., 372 n.
 Horseshoeing of arches, see Index II.
 Housesteads, 60.
 Howorth, Sir Henry, his *Golden Days*, etc., referred to, 105, 118 n.
 Howth, 18.
 Hugh White (Hugo Candidus), 105.
 Hunterian Museum, Glasgow, 99 n., 254.
 Hutchinson, his *History of Durham*, quoted, 20.
 Hypocausts, 59.
- ICKLETON, 327, 418, Roman shafts at, 59, 419, narrow aisles, 64.
 Inchtuthil, 52.
 Ingelheim, 215.
 Interlaced work, at Heysham, 188.
 Irish Romanesque, 375.
 Irvine, J. T., quoted, 58, 170, referred to, 58, 116, 271, 274, 277, 298, 301, 314 n., 316 n.
 Issoudun Museum, 368.
 Italy, exaggerated importance of, 1.
- JOHN, the Old Saxon, Abbot of Athelney, 229.
 Jones, Canon, of Bradford-on-Avon, 297 f.
 Jumièges, 262, 410.

KILLINEY CHURCH, 44.

Kirk Levington, Yorks., carved stones at, 275.

LANCHESTER, 58.

Lanfranc and Conrad, their choirs at Canterbury, 382.

Lasteyrie, de, quoted, 168 n., 233, referred to, ix, 132, 200, 232 n., 234, 243, 329 n., 377, 408.

Lastingham, Saxon stone church at, 16, crypt, 129.

Leathley, 200.

Leclercq, Dom H., *Manuel d'Arch. Chrét.*, quoted, 90.

Leicester, museum at, 59.

Leofric and Godiva, 355, 472.

Lichfield, 187.

Lincoln, Lincolnshire, xiv, 119, 386, 416 n., 466 f.

Lincoln Cathedral, W front of, xv, 177, 445.

'Lincolnshire' towers, 386 f., and Index II, 'Towers.'

Lindisfarne, 71, 74, 75.

Lion-sur-mer, 388, 392.

'Lisenen': theories of their origin; in woodwork, 198, 238; in Roman pilasters, e.g. at the Thorhalle at Lorsch, 239.

Littlehampton, 16.

Lombardic Architecture, see Rivoira, Com-mendatore.

Lorenzo, S., at Milan, 181 f.

Lorsch, see 'Thorhalle.'

MACGIBBON AND ROSS, referred to, 17, 43.

Malling Tower, 469.

Malmesbury, St Peter at, 195.

Manor Houses, Saxon, 8.

Manor Office, Hexham, 150.

Mansi, *Concilia*, quoted, 90 n.

Manuel d'Archéologie Française, quoted, x, 244, 435, referred to, 132, 243, 368.

Margaret, at Dunfermline, 452.

Maria Antiqua, S., at Rome, 182.

Martorana at Palermo, 305.

Mary, St, at St Augustine, Canterbury, 87, 135.

Medeshamstede (Peterborough), 72, 105, 170.

Megalithic feeling in Irish work, 46.

Menevia (St David's), 44.

Mercia, her early greatness, her kings, 186, 318; her great abbeyes, 186; and Saxon architecture, 186 f.

Merovingian Gaul, as artistic source, 5; its early churches, 329.

Michelstadt in Odenwald, 100.

Micklethwaite, J. T., quoted, 271, 295, 336 n., 354, referred to, 1, 100 n., 212, 218, 233, 312 n., 321, 329, 337 n., 412.

Mid-wall shafts, whence derived, 3.

Migne, *Pat. Curs. Compl.*, 88, 331.

Milborne Port, Somerset, 241, 428, 470.

Moated mounds, Early Norman, 343.

Monastic cloister court, Schlosser on, 339.

Monuments, Ancient, Royal Commission on, and its *Reports*; ix, x, xii, xvii, 265 n., 367, 456, 457, 464, 483; quoted, 461.

Monuments, Department of Ancient, in Scottish Office of Works, 451, 468.

Mortar, Roman, 82, 84. See also 'Cement' and Index II.

'Mos Scottorum,' 42.

Mosaic pavements, Roman, 60, Christian, 62.

NAPIER, Professor, cited, 353.

Neustria, 231.

Neustrian centres and the monastic reform of X, 267.

Newgrange, tumulus at, 318.

Newport arch, Lincoln, 56.

Ninian, St, 44.

Norman architecture, its 'esprit de suite,' 4, different in England and the Duchy, 5, its greatness as compared with Saxon, 379, etc.

Norman church towers, placing of them, 236, 385 f., proportions, 388.

Normandy, a Neustrian region, 231.

Normans, their callousness, 277, their relations with the Saxons, 231, 433, and Ch. XIII, passim.

Northumberland, A History of, quoted, 150, 157.

Norway, timber churches of, 41, 196 f.

ODDA, EARL, at Deerhurst, 307 f.

Offa, of Mercia, 187, 228, coin of, 204*.

Office, H.M., of Works, xii, 39, 451, 468; in Scotland, 451, 468.

Old Saxony, its connection with Saxon England, 230.

Oliver, *Lives of Exeter Bishops*, 269.

Openings, Door and window: 26 f., 246 f.;

Celtic, 42-48; with inclined jambs, 46, With flat lintels, 42*, 48*.

Arched without imposts, 45*.

- Cut straight through walls (doors), 43*, 45*,
Internally played (windows), 45*;
- Roman, 49-53; cut straight through walls, 57,
Internally played (Cilurnum), 36*, 57,
Recessed (Trier), 57,
Construction of jambs, monolithic, 50*, 'upright and flat' (Pola), 52*,
Construction of heads, arched, passim, with flat lintels mortised into jambs, 50*;
- Saxon, see Index II, 'Openings, Saxon';
- Norman doorways; arched, passim,
With straight sided arch, 30,
With enriched tympana, 389, 394,
Recessed, 397, with angle shafts, 397 and passim;
- Norman Windows; arched, passim,
Arch cut out of lintel, 35,
With inclined jambs, 31,
Circular, 474, etc.,
Double played (exceptional), 474.
- Opus; Lateritium, 49, Quadratum, 49, 53, 56, Signinum, 57, 82, 96, Testaceum, 49.
- Ordericus Vitalis, quoted, 433.
- Orientation, westward, at Silchester, 61* f., at Ripon (?), 164.
- Oswald of Northumbria, 146.
- Oswald, Bp. of Worcester, 269, 381.
- Othona, Roman fort, 101.
- Otley, 207.
- Ottos of Saxony, the, 229.
- PACT OF WEDMORE, 196.
- Pagham, 9.
- Painting, Greek and Roman, 65.
- Parenzo in Istria, atrium and baptistry at, 329.
- Parker, Sir J. H., referred to, 1, 299, 467.
- Parthenon, the, W door at, 53*.
- Patrick, St, his chapel at Heysham, 188.
- Paulinus, 119.
- Penmon priory, 18.
- 'Perpendicular' clearstories, 20.
- Pharos, Roman, at Dover, 82, 354*.
- Philological Society, Transactions of*, 353.
- Pilae for hypocausts, 59.
- Plaster, see 'Cement' and Index II.
- Pola, Roman archway at, 52*, 139.
- Post-Carolingian Germany, 5, 227 f., 377.
- Potterne, 15.
- Priestholm, 18, 392.
- Prior Richard of Hexham, quoted and referred to, Ch. VI, passim, 373.
- Priory, the, at Deerhurst, 218.
- Puffin Island, 18.
- QUEDLINBURG, Schloss Kirche at, 430.
- Quoins, Roman, 53, Saxon, see Index II, Norman, 25, 390.
- RAINE, *Priory of Hexham*, quoted and referred to, Ch. VI, passim.
- Ramsey Abbey, church at, 268, 320, 354, 358, 383.
- Ravenna, S. Vitale at, 180 f., 234, Galla Placidia at, 301, S. Apollinare in Classe at, 301, S. Ap. Nuovo at, 305, Baptistry at, 305, external arcading at, 301.
- Regulbium, 96.
- Relics, mediaeval dealings with, 93, 152, 183.
- Reliquary, The*, quoted, 142 f., referred to, 133 n., 191, 357 n., 484.
- Remigius, Bp. of Lincoln, xv, 355.
- Repton, early religious foundation at, 186.
- Respond, Norman, at Hexham, 175, 414.
- Rickman, referred to, 1, 485.
- Rivoira, Commendatore, quoted, 301, 379, referred to, ix, 11, 34, 78, 99, 117, 180, 233, 242, 251, 301, 414, 416, 417, 420, 429, 431, 469.
- Roads, Roman, in Britain, 74, 292, 354.
- Robert, Bp. of St Andrews, 441.
- Robert, Ruprich, his *Architecture Normande*, quoted, 236, 401, referred to, 414.
- Rochester Castle, Early Norman work at, 469.
- Romano-British churches, 72, 76, 80, 480.
- Roman secular buildings, 58, 97, 107.
- Round towers, Irish, 199, East Anglian, 422, etc.
- Routledge, Canon, 80.
- Ruthwell Cross, 120, 207, 304.
- SABA, S., on the Aventine, 63, 179 n.
- Saints, Irish, 44.

Norman overlap, xv, 5, 18, 231,
. XIII and XIV, *passim*.
1 cathedrals and abbeys at the Con-
est, 380 f.
and, Society of Antiquaries of, xii.
m, 16.
enstadt, 331.
y, 9.
orothy, 16.
esbury, Alfred's convent at, 196.
pard, Dr, of Canterbury, 97.
ton Mallet, 16.
ies of popular saints, 183.
pshire Arch. Soc., *Transactions*, 478.
ester, 57, 60, 78.
nburn, 207.
ig Michael, 42*.
, human, on Hadstock door, 365.
e at Worcester, 129, 416.
ty of Antiquaries, *Proceedings*, 487.
of Ant. Newcastle-on-Tyne, *Pro-
edings*, referred to, 458.
kyrker, Norse, 41, 197, 206.
hen, St, church of, at Canterbury,
17.
tesdon, Salop, 394, 416.
uctura caementicia, 49.
bs, *Registrum*, etc., 272.
ex *Archaeological Collections*, referred
to, 456.
ex churches, Saxon or Norman (?), 456.
hun of Winchester, 195, 330.
eon of Durham, quoted, 147, 230,
82, referred to, 457.
a, as artistic source, 3.

' or 'TAU' PLAN, used in Early
Christian times at Rome and in Gaul,
ot at Ravenna or in N Africa, 168* f.,
74, 374.
nworth, 8.
ering of columnus, 98, 249.
ctonic, use of the word, 408 n.
nples, Roman, 58, 72, 86, Saxon, 72,
5 f.
tonic jewellery, 38, 280.
horhalle' at Lorsch, 239, 242*, 301.
orn, William, quoted, 85.
kencote, 336.
itigel Church, 18.
bias, Bp. of Rochester, 95 n.
oling, Roman, 51, 'Saxon,' 51.
wers, see Index II.
ransennae, 35, 273, of Italian origin,
75. See also Index II, 'Pierced
work.'

Transept, in Roman basilicas, 100, 374;
in Saxon buildings, see Index II,
'Porches, Lateral, etc.'; in VI churches
in Gaul, 168 n., 374.
Trier, Roman work at, 57, Austrasian
work at, 432*.
Trinity Church, Glendalough, 44*.
Tufa, meaning of word, 115 n., used by
Normans, 57, 465, by Romans, 57.
Twysden, *Decem Scriptores*, quoted, 86.
Tympanum, Enriched, a Norman special-
ity, 389*, 394*.

VAN DE PUTTE, *Annales Blandinienses*,
267 n.
Vaults, Roman, at Cilurnum, at Paris, 56;
Scottish, 65.
Veiling of hands, ceremonial, 305.
Ver, Normandy, 388, 392.
Victoria History of the Counties of England,
x, xiii, referred to, 13, 477, 483.
Viking axe-head from Repton, 319.
Vikings, 132, 185, 194, their influence on
English decorative art, 196, 273, on
coins, 196, on architecture, 198, 205.
Vinovium (Binchester), 140.
Viollet-le-Duc, quoted, 4.
Viroconium (Wroxeter), 194, 488.
Vitale, S., at Ravenna, 180 f., 234.

WALBERTON, 16.
Walls, Norman, 23, 428, decorative facing
of, 244 f.; Roman, thin rubble, 49, 52,
68, wood and plaster, 49, 57, decorative
facing of, 243.
Waltham Abbey Church, 378.
Wareham, Saxon earthworks, 7.
Weaverthorpe, Yorks., 388, 420.
Westminster, Edward's work at, 354, 378,
Early Norman work at, 316, 410.
Westphalian architecture, 235.
Whitby Hill, Early Saxon monastery on,
39.
Whiterne, 44.
Wilfrid, 105, 119, 164, 185, his character
and equipment, 120, 176, his enthus-
iasm for relics, 183.
William of Malmesbury, quoted, 187,
195, 297, 378, referred to, 17, 150, 160,
175, 302, 306.
William of Poitiers, cited, 229, 376.
Willis, Professor, quoted, 2, referred
to, 76 f., 89 n., 164 n., 282 n., 320,
383.
Wilne, Little, 15.

Wiltshire Magazine, quoted, 58, 297, 304,
referred to, xii, 36, 338 n.

Winchester; New Minster at, 196; Saxon
Cathedral at, 320, horseshoed arches in
N transept, 30.

Winchester, School of, 272, MSS., 305.
Wooden forts of the Normans, 198.

Wulfric II, of St Augustine, his central
church, 87, 135, 182, 371 f.
Wulfstan, Bp. of Worcester, 381.

Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, referred
to, 15, 203 n, 205 n.

